Class 282.42L Book F613
General Theological Seminary Library
Ninth Ave. and 20th St., New York.
Besides the main topic this book also treats of
v. 2
Subject No. | On page | Subject No. | On page
PRESENTED BY
SOC'Y for PROMOTING RELIGION and LEARNING.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/historyofchurchi0002very

A HISTORY

OF THE

CHURCH IN ENGLAND,

FROM

THE EARLIEST PERIOD, TO THE RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF THE HIERARCHY IN 1850.

BY THE

VERY REV. CANON FLANAGAN.

"Remember the days of old, think upon every generation: ask thy father, and he will declare to thee: thy elders, and they will tell thee."—DEUT. xxxii. 7.

GENTHEOLOGICAL SEMINARY LIBRARY NEW YORK

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

LONDON:
CHARLES DOLMAN, 61, NEW BOND STREET;
AND 22, PATERNOSTER ROW.
1857.

[The Right of Translation is reserved.]

22951

GEN.THEO.SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II.

INTRODUCTION.

The Systematic Tampering with History from the Reign of Henry VIII.—*Pages* 1—7.

CHAPTER I.

State of the Clergy in the Century previous to the Reformation—Heresy and Recantation of Peacock of Chichester—Zeal for Learning—Dr. Colet—Lilye and Whyttington—The Humanists—Erasmus—General Religious Condition of England.—*Pages* 8—15.

CHAPTER II.

Prosperous Condition of England at the Accession of Henry VIII.—Character of the new King—His Marriage—Anne Boleyn—Circumstances, both Domestic and Foreign, that favoured a Divorce—Wolsey—Luther and his Fellow-Reformers—Revolt of the Anabaptists—Henry writes against Luther—Receives from the Holy See the Title of Defender of the Faith—The First Projects for obtaining a Divorce—The two Embassies—Gardiner's disrespectful Language to Clement VII.—The Decretal Bull—Henry's Fury—Campeggio's Mission—His Reception—Sentiments of the People—The Sweating Sickness—Fright, Repentance, and Relapse of Henry—His Speech to the Citizens—His Insincerity—Trial at the Black Friars—The King's Wrath—The Triumph and Revenge of the Boleyns—Death of Wolsey—Persecutions of Catherine.—*Pages* 16—41.

CHAPTER III.

Henry's Threats—The Universities tampered with for Opinions—A National Remonstrance got up—Clement's Reply—Cromwell's Suggestion—The Clergy sued in a Præmunire—Their prolonged Debates, and qualified Concession—Protest and Death of Warham—An Inhibitory Bull—Seizure of the Annats—More's Reply to the Supplication of Beggars—Henry wrests from the Convocation a Surrender of its Right of making Constitutions.—*Pages* 42—52.

CHAPTER IV.

Anne Boleyn's New Title and Income—The Marriage Ceremony—Rewards for the Promoters of the Divorce—Cranmer as Archbishop—His Oaths, Private Protest, and Sentence of Divorce—Indignation—Zeal of the Friars—Cranmer's Sentence annulled by the Holy See—Henry's Schismatical Appeal—Clement's Definitive Sentence—Death of Catherine—Joy and Execution of Anne Boleyn.—*Pages* 53—59.

CHAPTER V.

Statutes against the Holy See in its Confirmation of Synodal Regulations, and of the Elections of Prelates; and in its Law of Appeals and Grant of Spiritual Powers—Parliamentary Confirmation of the Marriage of Henry and Anne, and its Train of New Oaths and Punishments—The Oath of Obedience to this Act—Sir Thomas More's Resignation of the Seals—Fisher of Rochester, and Elizabeth Barton, the Nun of Canterbury—More and Fisher are committed to the Tower—The Act and Oath of Supremacy—Trial and Execution of Fisher and More—Triumph of the Secular Power—Latimer—Injunctions against the Defenders of the Supremacy of the Holy See.—*Pages* 60—73.

CHAPTER VI.

A Royal Visitation—Cromwell, Vicar-General—The Bishops pretend to receive Jurisdiction from the Crown—Confiscation of the Lesser Monasteries—The Pilgrimages of Grace—Cardinal Pole—A Visitation of the Greater Monasteries—The Execution of the more zealous of the Abbots—Images and Relics vilified—Mock Trial of St. Thomas, and Destruction of his Shrine—Excommunication of Henry VIII.—Suppression of the Greater Monasteries, and consequent Accumulation of Wrongs—Death of Cromwell—Henry's Codes of Doctrines and Penal Laws—Shaxton and Latimer—The New Principle of Belief—Last Measures and Death of Henry—His Panegyrists.—*Pages* 74—95.

CHAPTER VII.

Conduct and Schemes of Cranmer and Hertford—Gradual Changes—The Injunctions—Gardiner's Opposition and Arrest—A New Visitation—The Homilies, &c.—Preaching impeded—Statutes—New Confiscations, and a new Service—Opposition of the Parochial Clergy—Traditions regarding the Blessed Virgin—Insurrections—Sacrileges, Disgrace, and Death of Somerset—Grammar Schools—Repeated Acts of Pillage.—*Pages* 96—107.

CHAPTER VIII.

The two Arrests of Gardiner and Bonner—Ridley, Heath, Day, and Hooper—Gardiner's Demand and Deprivation—The Paid Itinerant Preachers—Smithfield Fires—The Forty-two Articles—The new and abortive Code—Death of Edward VI.—*Pages* 108—116.

CHAPTER IX.

The Succession—Northumberland and the Lady Jane Grey—Mary's Promptitude and Success—Ridley and other Preachers—Death of Northumberland—Speech of Gates before his Execution—The Tower Prisoners—Revision of certain Laws—Noailles—Wyatt's Rebellion—The Haunted Wall—Death of Cranmer—Reception of Pole as Legate—Return to Obedience—A Provincial Synod.—*Pages* 117—131.

CHAPTER X.

The Succession—Elizabeth's Character—The Seven New Counsellors—Orthodox Preaching impeded and punished—The Plan—Symptoms of Elizabeth's Heterodoxy—Refusal of the Bishops to crown her—Oglethorp's Rashness and Repentance—The Elections—The Parliament—Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity—Unanimous Opposition of the Prelates and of Convocation—Montague's Remonstrance—General Excitement—Discussion at Westminster—Destruction of Crucifixes—Administration of the Oath of Supremacy—The Universities almost deserted—Appropriation of Church Property—Consecration of Parker—Bonner and Horne—Declaration of Parliament—The new Clergy—External Changes limited, and why—Partial Defeat of Elizabeth's Plan.—*Pages* 132—162.

CHAPTER XI.

Letter of Pius IV. to Elizabeth—His fruitless Invitation—Decision regarding Attendance at Church—New Penal Laws against the Defence, even in Conversation, of the Pope's Supremacy—Mary, Queen of Scots—Her Appeal for Rescue—Insurrection—Martial Law—Death of Northumberland—Cruel and indiscriminate Punishment of Beggars—Plagues—Piracies.—*Pages* 163—174.

CHAPTER XII.

Dr. Allen—His Zeal against Heresy and Outward Conformity—The Seminary at Douay—Its first Priests—The Remnant of the English Hierarchy at the Holy See—Decree of St. Pius V.—Felton's Boldness and Death—Increased Rigour of the Penal Laws—Trial

of Roland Jenks—The Proto-Martyr of Douay—Martyrdom of Nelson—Emigration from Douay to Rheims—Everard Hanse—A Glance into the Interior of the Seminary—The English College at Rome.—*Pages* 175—197.

CHAPTER XIII.

St. Ignatius of Loyola's Desire to assist England—Campion and Persons—Jesuits sent to England—Previous Conversation of Campion and Allen—Campion's Sermons and Labours—Decision regarding Attendance at the Protestant Service—Perils—Arrest of Campion—The pretended Plot—Campion's Defence at his Trial—Executions.—*Pages* 198—214.

CHAPTER XIV.

The Six Articles, and the Replies of the Priests under Sentence of Death—Elizabeth's Proclamations—Allen's "Defence or Apology"—His "Reply" to the Execution of Justice—Failure of Elizabeth's Plan for Uniformity—Grindall and Whitgift—The Three Articles and their Effect.—*Pages* 215—227.

CHAPTER XV.

Informers—Nichols dragged to Church—His Conversation with Kirby—Secret Traitors—Babington's Plot artfully extended by Walsingham—Tyrrell's Fall and Recantation—New Treasons—Pretended Trial of Mary, Queen of Scots—Her Execution.—*Pages* 227—237.

CHAPTER XVI.

The Persecution from Death of Campion to that of Elizabeth—Treatment of Prisoners—Old Newgate—"Little Ease"—Felton—Punishment of Petitioning—Generous Sufferings of the Clitheroes, and of several Ladies—Southwell.—*Pages* 238—250.

CHAPTER XVII.

Walsingham's Emissaries at Rome—A Dissension in the English Seminary—Father Persons, and the Houses of Seville, Valladolid, Lisbon and St. Omer's—The Confessors at Wisbeach Castle: Watson of Lincoln, Feckenham, Mettam, and Weston—Some Agitation—Peace—The English College at Rome quieted by Barrett and Persons—Louvain.—*Pages* 251—263.

CHAPTER XVIII.

General Desire for a Superior in England—Blackwell appointed Archpriest—Appeals to Rome—Bluet's "Plot"—The Succession—James I. —The Pope's Advice—The Catholic Petition, and Protestant "Counterpoise"—Watson's Plot—New Penal Laws—Stress of the Persecution in Herefordshire—Martyrdom of Sugar, Gressold, and others.—*Pages* 264—277.

CHAPTER XIX.

The Gunpowder Plot—Unjust Accusation of the Jesuits—Henley—Capture, Trials, and Death of Garnet and Oldcorne, and their Servants.—*Pages* 278—287.

CHAPTER XX.

A Proclamation against the Clergy—Its invidious Distinction—The Declaration of Allegiance—The Act for "Repressing Popish Recusants," and its Oath of Allegiance—The "Act to prevent and avoid Dangers," &c.—Attempted Distinction between "Papist" and "Catholic"—Voluntary Exile—General Fervour—The Envoy of Paul V.—His Letter against the "Rites" of Heretics, condemnatory of the Oath, and in praise of the English "Martyrs"—Holtby—Drury—The Pope's second Letter upon the Oath—Blackwell deprived—Birkhead or Birket becomes Archpriest—Sebert or Sigebert Buckley—Martyrs—Anthony de Dominis.—*Pages* 288—304.

CHAPTER XXI.

Petitions for a Bishop—Dr. Kellison—Consecration of Dr. Bishop—His Reply—The Spanish Match—Renewal of Persecution—The English Chapter—Fatal Accident at the French Ambassador's—Summary of the Reign of James I.—Marriage and Pledge of Charles I.—Dr. Smith—The Persecution again renewed—Letter of Urban VIII.—Dr. Smith's Scruples on Jurisdiction and Approbation—He quits the Country—The Chapter—Letter of Urban VIII.—*Pages* 305—317.

CHAPTER XXII.

The two Pamphlets on the Oath of Allegiance—Panzani's Mission—Brett's Object at Rome—The two Conventions—Father Blount's Expostulation—Panzani's Departure—The Number of Missionaries —Character of the Secular Clergy.—*Pages* 318—324.

CHAPTER XXIII.

The Character of Charles I.—The Catholics sacrificed to appease the Opposition—The contradictory Elements in Anglicanism—The King's supposed Catholic Tendencies—The Long Parliament—Magnanimity of Goodman—Confessors and Martyrs—Anglicanism supplanted—Rigorous Persecution—Oath of Abjuration—The Sequestrators—The Question of the State of Perfection, and of the Oath to serve on the Mission—Brief of Alexander VII.—*Pages* 325—339.

CHAPTER XXIV.

Disinterested Loyalty of the Catholics—Charles II. too politic to be grateful—Petition of the Catholics—Crafty Amendment, and loss of the Opportunity—The Corporation and Conventicle Statutes—The London Fire and its Monument—Discovery of Catholic Schools and Chapels—Shaftesbury, the designing Alarmist—His chief Tool, Titus Oates—Martyrdom of Wall and Kemble.—*Pages* 340—351.

CHAPTER XXV.

Accession of James II.—Sunderland and Father Petre—General Toleration—The four Vicars Apostolic—Dr. Leyburn and Blackloism—Dr. Leyburn's Visitation—The Claim of the Benedictines—Decree—The Revolution, and Destruction of Chapels—Father Palmer and the Savoy.—*Pages* 352—361.

CHAPTER XXVI.

Continuance of Persecution—Walpole's Assessment—Some new Penal Laws—Schools—Sedgley Park—Dr. Challoner—His Reply to Middleton, and Flight—His Manner of Life as Bishop—Dr. Walmesley's Pastorini—Dr. Hornyold—His Zeal and Escapes—The New Marriage Act—The Rules of the Mission.—*Pages* 362—373.

CHAPTER XXVII.

Pressure of the Penal Laws—Payne, the Informer—The Relief Bill of '78—Clamour against it—Wesley and O'Leary—The "No-popery" Petition—Riots of '80—Death of Dr. Challoner—His Industry—His Veneration for St. Vincent of Paul.—*Pages* 374—386.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

Relaxation of Fervour—Some Instances of Apostasy—Miserable Death of Billinge—The Committee—Its early Tendencies—Errors of Joseph Berington and Dr. Geddes—Pitt's Three Questions—The "Declaration and Protestation"—The Protestation Oath—"Pro-

testing Catholic Dissenters"—The "Encyclical Letter"—Wilks and Reeves—The first Blue-book—Attempt of the Committee to elect Bishops—The Letters by a Layman—Pilling, Milner, and Plowden—The Committee's Attempt to elect a Bishop—A second Encyclical—Strange Protest—Milner's "Facts"—The Committee's Relief Bill amended and passed—The Committee becomes the "Cisalpine Club"—The Mediators—The Staffordshire Clergy—Death of Dr. Berington.—*Pages* 387—408.

CHAPTER XXIX.

Dr. Stapleton, Dr. Milner, and Dr. Poynter—Immigration of the French Clergy—Blanchardism—Declaration of the Irish Bishops—Origin and Nature of the Veto Question—Milner's first Hesitation and subsequent inflexible Opposition—The Declaration of the Irish Bishops—Vexation and Plans of the Whigs—The Board and Select Board—Preparations for a new Relief-bill—The "Fifth Resolution"—Attempts to ensnare Dr. Milner—The Meeting at St. Alban's Tavern—The Fifth Resolution carried, and a Petition embodying it presented—Wyndham's Tribute to the Catholic Gentry. —*Pages* 409—424.

CHAPTER XXX.

The Dublin Synod thanks Dr. Milner—Dr. Moylan's Mission—The Episcopal Meeting at Durham—The Bill of 1813—Its six Oaths—The Catholic Bible Society—Dr. Milner's Censure upon Archer's Sermons.—*Pages* 425—431.

CHAPTER XXXI.

Quarantotti's Rescripts—Dr. Milner and Dr. Poynter at the Holy See —Cardinal Litta to Dr. Poynter—Pius VII. to the Irish Bishops—Sir John Hippesley's Proposal and Collection—Resolutions of the Vicars Apostolic—The Test of Blanchardism—The New Veto Bill of 1821—Dr. Milner restrained by the Holy See—His Death and Character—His Institute of the "Free Society of the Secular Clergy"—His Prudence in regard to the "Staffordshire Clergy."— —*Pages* 432—442.

CHAPTER XXXII.

Efforts in Ireland for Emancipation—The Irish Bishops and the House of Commons—The War of Pamphlets—Sidney Smith to the Electors—The Declaration of the Vicars Apostolic—Death of Dr. Poynter—Dr. Milner's Sentiments regarding him—The Test and Corporation Acts repealed—Emancipation—A Retrospect.—*Pages* 443—451.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

Cardinal Weld—Stonyhurst—The "Oxford Movement"—Newman becomes its Leader—Littlemore—Conversions—The Oratorians—Dr. Baines and Prior Park—Dr. Griffiths—Additional Vicars Apostolic—General desire for the Re-establishment of the Hierarchy—Dr. Walsh—Pugin—Oscott—Decree for the Re-establishment of the Hierarchy—A Retrospect—The Conclusion.—*Pages* 452—467.

ERRATA IN VOL. II.

Page 87 (*note*), *last line but one*, *for* '87,' *read* '88.'
,, 206, *line* 36, *for* 'twelve,' *read* 'thirteen.'
,, 209, ,, 21, *for* 'released,' *read* 'acquitted.'
,, 313, ,, 21, *for* 'or,' *read* 'nor.'
,, 412, ,, 4, *after* 'there,' *supply* 'and at Vernon Hall, near St. Helen's, Liverpool.'

HISTORY

OF

THE CHURCH IN ENGLAND.

INTRODUCTION.

On approaching the second part of the History of the Church in England, investigation becomes gradually more and more painful. This arises not from a want of materials; but from a want of independence on the part of historians, and from the too evident change in their estimation of truth. When an investigator of this period begins his inquiries, he perhaps seizes eagerly upon Polydore Vergil, as an enlightened foreigner, and, it might be thought, an impartial witness of the events of the first half of the sixteenth century. To his utter disappointment, the stream of Polydore's history grows less and less, as it approaches the reign of Henry VIII.; and then, at the very crisis of Wolsey's fall and Catherine's divorce, it ceases altogether. Nor is this to be wondered at: Polydore presented his work to Henry VIII.; and when we remember that king's character, and the suppleness of Polydore, who took the oath of supremacy, and so retained his archdeaconry of Wells, our only surprise is that the trembling courtier dared to say so much. If the inquirer turn to other contemporary writers, he finds not only the more pardonable omissions of Polydore, but much that is at variance with real documents, and a tone that little suits the stern judgments of history. His wonder partially ceases when he discovers that these works, one and all, are dedicated to the sovereign or to the prime minister: Hall's, for instance, to Edward VI.; Fox's and Holingshed's

to Elizabeth; and Camden's to Lord Burghley. Had these works been less fulsome, less evidently written not so much for truth as for a temporary purpose, they might have transmitted to the latest posterity the names of their patrons, as names well deserving of literature, and, in some degree, of the whole human race. When, however, we calmly peruse them, and discover their real object, we ascertain, at length, the real character not only of the works themselves, but of those who suggested and encouraged them.

This systematic tampering with history, and even with the new editions of authors long deceased, began with the very first changes of the Reformation. The most popular chronicle in the time of Henry VIII. was perhaps that of Fabyan, a London alderman, who died in the beginning of that reign (A.D. 1512). When, towards the end of the reign, a new edition was issued, it came out still as Fabyan's, but, whereas the alderman had called St. Thomas a glorious martyr, he was now, in the new edition, some thirty years after his death, made to call him a traitorous bishop; and whereas the greater part of his account could not be so easily transposed to Henry's liking, the poor alderman was made to omit the greater part of it, and to accommodate "the rest," as his Protestant editor, Sir Henry Ellis, avouches, "to the changes which had taken place in religion."* The king's subjects would thus be entrapped into the belief, that Fabyan himself made use of the expressions, and gave the precise account, which were thus basely published. There is, perhaps, reason to believe that other works were tampered with; not only, as all acknowledge, in such words as pope, martyr, &c., but in important passages. How far such disingenuous practices were or were not extended to various original manuscripts, it would perhaps be difficult to ascertain, from the great number which are known to have since perished.

* Preface to the edition of 1811, p. xx.

It was not, however, until the reign of Elizabeth, that the theory, according to which all English ecclesiastical history was to be written, was actually sketched; nor until that of James I. and Charles I., that it was completely matured and adopted.

Parker and Fox, in the prefaces to their works, speak plainly of some such theory. Thus, in the preface to his Antiquities of the British Church ("De Antiquitate," &c.), Parker avows that his object, in part, was to exhibit the British Church as the prototype of the Anglican establishment; and that it had been "changed into a new form" by Pope Gregory the Great.* His ulterior purpose in this is very palpable. He himself, with the assistance of Jewel of Salisbury, had drawn up and published the second book of Homilies (A.D. 1562), one passage of which has the portentous announcement that the "laity and clergy, learned and unlearned, all ages, sects, and degrees of men, women, and children, of all Christendom (an horrible and most dreadful thing to think), have been at once drowned in abominable idolatry: of all other vices most detested of God and most damnable to man, and that by the space of eight hundred years and more."†

Having thus consigned twenty generations of their forefathers to the bottomless pit, the next assertion of these reformers was, that they had cut away all that was evil, and had thus restored England to primitive simplicity. Hence the effort to prove this from history; and well would it have been for them and for others, had they been content to abide by the proofs of history.

The plan thus distinctly traced out was filled up by the next generation. It was intended by Elizabeth's

* The point to be worked up is thus briefly but significantly hinted at by Strype:—"The king's authority: archbishops, bishops, and ecclesiastical laws made by King Lucius, without the Pope."—(Str.'s Eliz. App. No. 8, p. 20.) The skill with which antiquaries create difficulties for their own solution is proverbial.

† Homilies, 3rd part of Serm. against the Peril of Idolatry, p. 143, ed. of 1683.

ministers to found and endow, under the title of an Antiquarian Society, an institution for these purposes.* The design was partially executed in the abortive attempt to found Chelsea College, with its dean, seventeen fellows, and two historians.

The object of this institution, as contemporary Protestants tell us, was to write against popery.† The nature of such writing we are left to discover; but it is disclosed in various passages of published letters. It was the same, only more fully matured, as that of Parker. One of its favourite theories was that the Ancient British Church had its "customs" not from Rome, but from the East; and that St. Gregory and St. Augustine were "subtle enough" to take advantage of the wars between the Britons and Anglo-Saxons, and of other circumstances, to make "Rome the better domineer."

Full of this idea, Abraham Whelock thus writes to Sir Symonds D'Ewes, in January, 1639:—

"I could wish that our learned gentry (if peace continue) would employ some scholars to be under them (and myself, though most unworthy of that honour, would willingly be one), to compile a body of our divinity; I say of our doctrine, out of the Saxon and British writers: and to present the Papists with these, as a rule to lead them by, if they would be constant to the best antiquities. Most sure it is, that antiquity tells us we owe more to the Eastern Church than to Rome: and what of good from Rome, even that we have from the Eastern." That the British Church followed "the customs of the East," "an

* See Sir Henry Ellis's Lett. of Emin. Liter. Men, No. 27, Rich. Carew of Anth. to Sir Rob. Cotton, in April, 1605, Cam. Soc.

† Stowe's Contin.; Wilson's James I. (in Ken. Complete Hist.) p. 685. Wilson was born in the beginning of James's reign.

The object of the college is incontrovertible; and therefore Gough, Camden's well-known editor, says plainly, almost in the words of Wilson, that it was "for a certain number of learned men, who were to be employed in writing against popery, on a plan proposed by Dr. Sutcliffe, dean of Westminster."—Gough's ed. of Top. Brit. pref. p. viii.

easy matter it is to see in Bede, Malmesbury, Harding," &c.

Whelock, moreover, suggests a few points to be made prominent: that St. Augustine "baffled Ethelbert" by not leaving his conversion to Bertha's chaplain; that "Gregory was subtle enough," "when he reserved a pallium and dotum for ever to be sent from Rome." In short, as it was too plain that the Anglo-Saxons were converted from Rome, the matter was to be made discreditable.

"What Augustine did concerning the slaughter of the Bangor monks, with the blessed Fox I say I cannot tell." Of six ancient manuscripts which Whelock had access to, the three Latin ones "agree that then Augustine was dead;" and three Saxon ones, Alfred's translation, leave out the passage altogether; but his determination, for it cannot be called his conclusion, is this: "Sufficient it is to say, he [Augustine] prophesied, that is threatened, the destruction of the fountains and seminaries of the Ancient British Church: for that was of them intended, that Rome may the better domineer."*

Thus, although Mr. Whelock could not tell what Augustine did, he is yet able to divine his intentions, and represents his prophecy as a threat which his party would fulfil, in order to insure the domination of Rome!

The predominating idea in the busy, but not always profound, researches of that age, was, therefore, to make out that Rome was not the fountain-head of Britain's Christianity. Spelman seems to have fully adopted Whelock's ideas. He wrote to him as early as Sept. 1638, to say that he "moved" the bishop of Ely "about our desired lecture of domestic antiquities touching our church," &c. He adds, "And before we make too much noise of it, we must, like prudent builders, consider and revolve of the plot and fabrick of our purpose, what it shall be, how prosecuted and

* Let. of Emin. Liter. Men, No. 57. In No. 56 we learn that Spelman obtained for Whelock a Norfolk vicarage.

supported afterward," &c.* In the same spirit, it was suggested by others, that history should be so written as to show that the Pope's supremacy was merely an unjustifiable appropriation of some of the rights of kings and bishops. "And it may be of very good use," wrote Bedell, one who was afterwards an Irish Protestant bishop,—of very good use "to one that would write our ecclesiastical history, to show how the see and court of Rome encroached upon the jurisdiction of bishops and princes, by exemptions, appropriations, provisions, and collations," &c.†

Now, if a theory be in history what it is in science, merely a help to the attainment of the real truth, a scaffolding to be thrown down as soon as the fabric is completed, there is, so far, no reason for disapprobation. But what if such a theory admit on set purpose only a portion of the truth? If such a portion be in harmony with the other facts, with the whole truth, as far as it can be discovered, there is still no room for blame. For, indeed, it is impossible to discover every one of the facts of history; so that history is, after all, only a part of the facts.

If, on the other hand, the portion of truth thus selected, conveys an impression not at all in harmony with that which would be produced by a more extended survey of facts, then is it more mischievous thus to produce a part, truthful in itself, than to write a tissue of palpable falsehoods. The falsehoods may be easily detected; but a few facts true in themselves, but producing a false impression, are liable to create a lasting prejudice, as being capable of a defence but too plausible in the eyes of the half-educated masses.

Now, instead of waiting to discover whether the general facts of history would harmonize with their theory, the writers of the Reformation laid down a plan regarding the British Church and the conduct of the popes; and then made a selection of facts, purposely to support this view. Was this, I will not say

* Sir H. Ellis's Letters of Em. Lit. Men, No. 55.
† Ib. No. 45.

honesty, but was it that disinterested love of truth that ought to accompany historical investigations?

I will say no more upon this point. My object is not polemics. I leave conclusions to others. This much, however, appeared to me necessary for the elucidation of history itself. I must know and test the character of my vouchers before I can admit their testimony, and, unfortunately, the vouchers from the time of the Reformation to the present day, have, with few exceptions, been pledged to a one-sided statement, and, moreover, have too often indulged in a strain of vituperation, as uncalled for as it was unnecessary and unhistorical.

If any one wishes to see how far more recent historians, such as Hume and Robertson, have acted upon the principles of Parker and Fox, let him read and weigh carefully the abundant quotations of Maitland's "Dark Ages." If he would, moreover, learn the character of the Puritan writers, he will find it in the same writer's "Essays." It is perhaps too severe; but, on the whole, it appears sufficiently accurate.

With regard to the more or less offensive tone of most of the writers thus referred to, whether Puritan or Anglican, one passage will be a sufficient specimen. Hooker, the continuator of Holingshed, is not content with calling the Pope "the son of Satan, and the man of sin, and the enemy unto the cross of Christ, whose bloodthirstiness will never be quenched;" but thus continues: "Because he cannot perform also within the realms of England and Ireland," "the infinite and most horrible massacres and bloody persecutions which he daily exerciseth throughout all Christian lands, what practices hath he made by enchantments, sorceries, witchcrafts, and treasons to bereave her majesty of her life!" *

In his love for straightforward truthfulness, the reader will pardon a piece of criticism which the writer would willingly have omitted, had he not deemed it indispensable for the due appreciation of his authorities.

* Hol. Chron. vol. vi. p. 460.

CHAPTER I.

STATE OF THE BISHOPS AND CLERGY IN THE LATTER PART OF THE FIFTEENTH AND BEGINNING OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURIES—PEACOCK OF CHICHESTER'S HERESY AND RECANTATION—STATE OF LEARNING—DR. COLET'S ZEAL, CHARITY, AND LOVE OF COMFORT—OTHER LEARNED MEN—POLYDORE VERGIL'S TESTIMONY OF THE GENERAL STATE OF RELIGION.

AWARE that he has now reached the period immediately previous to the Reformation, the reader may, naturally, expect to have his attention drawn to the growing causes of that event. With one class of causes, indeed, those royal aggressions that all but destroyed the controlling supervision of the Holy See, he has already been but too well acquainted. Any other adequate cause, except the immediate one, the passions of Henry VIII., either does not exist, or has eluded the writer's observation.

Events and opinions, and all the tissue of good and evil that marks human life, were growing and decaying much the same as in the two former centuries. In the midst of all this, the Church in England seems to have been generally careful of its allotted task. The bishops, if sometimes worldly-minded, were often strenuous and devout. They appear to have kept vigilant watch, just as in earlier times, over both clergy and people, in order to repress the very first growth of evil. If, sometimes, they were too subservient to the despotism of the Crown, their order, at least, had not become, as on some neighbouring parts of the continent, a sort of heir-loom and stronghold of the aristocracy, or a caste supplied from the ranks, and redolent of the manners, of a haughty baronage.

When Harpsfeld is narrating the history of Stafford, the successor of Chicheley of Canterbury, he pauses to

remark, that men of noble birth were but seldom raised to the episcopal dignity; and were very rarely indeed thus honoured, perhaps not more than once or twice, out of mere regard to their family connection, the choice being almost invariably made from the known virtue and learning of the bishop elect.*

It is true, on the other hand, that one of the bishops in the middle of the fifteenth century, Reginald Peacock, of Chichester, was publicly convicted of heresy; but this is nothing more than has occurred in almost every age, from the days of Judas to our own. Reginald's errors were of the grossest nature: he asserted, as he himself afterwards acknowledged, that the universal Church might err in matters of faith; and that it is not necessary to believe that Christ descended into hell; or in the Holy Ghost; or in the Catholic Church; or the communion of saints; or the teaching of a general council.

He made a public recantation of all these errors at St. Paul's Cross (A.D. 1457), declaring that he fell through trusting to his own natural powers, instead of the Old and New Testament, and the authority of the Church. His writings were publicly burnt.†

Whilst the bishops, as a body, appear, notwithstanding this exception, to have been generally exemplary both in faith and morality, the clergy appear to have been equally so. When, towards the close of the fifteenth century, John Morton, the archbishop of Canterbury, was holding a synod, he bore an indirect but strong testimony to this fact, by stating that his anxiety then was, lest in his own days, when some of the clergy were affecting the dress of the laity, the

* Harpsf. p. 621.

† Fabyan; Harpsf. 641; Wilk. Conc. iii. p. 576; and Lewis's "Peacock," p. 160, Oxford, 1820. This life of Peacock is a singular specimen of biography. Its principal authorities, Matthew of Paris, Hall, Selden, &c., are men who lived either long before or long after the times of Peacock. It is interwoven throughout with episodes and invectives that have little or nothing to do with poor Peacock. Yet it was reprinted, and in this very state, by the university of Oxford!

Church in England should fall from that goodness of life and propriety of manners which in former times had been its badge and glory.*

If it be thought that this general goodness of life may have coexisted with great ignorance, the parent of error, this supposition is neither to be reconciled with the works of art, miracles in their way, that mark considerably more than the first half of the century;† nor with the multitude of learned men that appeared at its close, and still more at the beginning of the sixteenth century. That learning did, indeed, as soon as the civil wars were over, begin to recover, and that the most learned in the country did not disdain the schoolmaster's drudgery, in hopes of perpetuating the improvement, may be seen from the letters written at the time, or the works of such men as the bishop of Rochester and Sir Thomas More; but the purpose of the present history will be sufficiently answered by a glance into the lives of the learned men, as collected, for the most part, by Wood, the historian of the university of Oxford.

After the battle of Bosworth, Holte, a fellow of Magdalen College, "being esteemed the most eminent grammarian of his time, devoted himself successfully to the task of training scholars, and laying in their minds a solid foundation. His grammar, entitled 'Lac Puerorum,' was much used, and was taken into the hands of all sorts of scholars."

Dr. John Colet, "the learned dean of St. Paul's," and William Lilye, the first master of St. Paul's School, laboured strenuously in the same department. Cardinal Wolsey himself did not disdain these humble but important occupations, prefixing an epistle to

* Wilk. Conc. iii. p. 619.

† The existence of such a writer as Lynwode, the author of the "Provincial Constitutions" of the archbishops, and other works, who died in 1446 (Wm. of Worces.), and his contemporary, John Capgrave, the Augustinian, famous for his Lives of English Saints, and whose learning and piety have earned the eulogium of Harpsfeld (p. 634), is a fact of itself, if even it were the only one of the kind, quite irreconcilable with such a supposition.

"Lilye's English Syntax," "with directions for teaching the eight classes or forms in Ipswich School."

Dr. Colet was son of Sir Henry Colet, who was twice Lord Mayor of London. Educated at first in his native country, he continued his studies in France and Italy. Returning to England, he went to Oxford, and gave public and gratuitous lectures upon St. Paul's Epistles, which were attended not only by crowds of the students, but "by all the great men of the university." He left a well-endowed school, built in St. Paul's Churchyard, for three hundred and fifty-three poor men's children. Long before his death, he built for himself a magnificent residence, within the inclosure of the Carthusian monastery, near Richmond. To those who expressed their surprise at his doing so, he used to remark that he had built it for his old age, intending to enjoy himself with his intimate friends in philosophical conversation. Was this a characteristic of the age? Kings have laid aside their crowns, and cardinals their purple, in order to close their life in solitude and penance. Colet, a priest though he was, preferred to imitate the literary ease and splendid seclusion that delighted a Cicero and a Sallust; or, perhaps, to see his halls crowded with literary men, as he had witnessed in the half-pagan palaces of Italians, themselves too strongly imitating a mere pagan refinement. If, in this, he were not an exception, then would such a fact be portentous enough; earthly comfort and intellectual solace predominating, even at the close of life, over the spirit of penance and the yearning for God. Colet's wish to enjoy his old age was frustrated by inexorable Death.*

Another "most singular light of learning," continues Wood, was William Grocyn. Having been trained in Wickham's school, near Winchester, he became fellow of New College, Oxford, and divinity reader of Magdalen College. Although "accounted excellent in the Latin and Greek tongues, according

* Erasm. Epp. pp. 435 and 702, &c. Lond. 1642; A. Wood's Athen. Ox. p. 7, &c. John Holte, Colet.

to the then knowledge of them," he felt his deficiencies; and therefore, travelling into Italy, he studied under the celebrated Greeks "Demetrius, Chalcondile, and Politian." Returning to England, and becoming professor of Greek, he earned the panegyric of Stapleton, the famous Catholic divine in the reign of Elizabeth, for being the first to introduce Greek literature into this country. This panegyric must, of course, be received in a very modified sense.

William Lilye, already mentioned, after a short stay at Oxford, made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem; "learned the Greek and Latin tongues exactly" during a considerable stay at Rhodes, finished his education at Rome, and finally settled in London, and there "taught grammar, poetry, and rhetoric." In 1512, Dr. Colet, having founded his school to the east of the cathedral, and within its precincts, appointed Lilye to be its first master. Lilye, at Colet's request, drew up his famous Latin grammar, or rather series of portions of a Latin grammar, to one of which Erasmus prefixed an introduction.

Robert Whyttington, a native of Lichfield, was educated at Oxford, and ordained priest. His great delight was the education of youth. In this "he became so excellent, that it was thought, especially by those that favoured him, that he surpassed William Lilye." With Lilye and other grammarians of the day he had many a sharp passage, not indeed of arms, but of biting wit and satire.

Notices of this kind, as well as Wood's statement that the Dominicans under Henry VII. were "noted in England and elsewhere for their religion and learning," will be sufficient to prove that immediately before the Reformation gross or contented ignorance was by no means the characteristic of the English.*

There was, however, in the midst of the general ardour for classical knowledge, a tendency to undervalue some of the most important studies. Those in

* A. Wood's Athen. vol. i. Wm. Buth, &c. Bliss's ed.; Lilye's "Eight Parts of Speech," &c.

whom this tendency was most striking became known as Humanists. They existed chiefly in the universities; and had already shown, both in England and on the Continent, a tone of irreverence for the teachings and institutions of the Church.

Latin and Greek and Hebrew had become in England, as in Germany, in the minds of many, not a means, but an end, in education. The solid studies of theology and its multifarious branches had become depreciated. The trivial style in which these studies had been sometimes written was made a reason for passing bad jokes upon the studies themselves. From treating thus lightly the science of theology, the transition was but too easy, in superficial or wicked minds, to attack the subject-matter, the doctrines involved in the science which was thus foolishly despised. In this manner, a party styled Humanists, from their knowledge being principally confined to the Humanities, or Greek and Latin classics, was gradually formed, and became, at last, almost ripe for revolt, not only against theology and the lovers of theology, but against the guide, and mistress, and interpreter of the substance of theology, the Church itself. Luther may be truly called, in some respect, the expression, the voice, of this anti-Catholic spirit. Startled by such a voice, many of the Humanists recoiled from their ill-grounded theories. Others, on the contrary, rallied to the cry, and avowed themselves disciples of Luther, or some other of the new teachers. Others, again, endeavoured for a time to adopt a middle course. Without openly defending Luther, they adopted a tone which shocks the practical Catholic. They affected to be of the Church, yet, on the one hand, affected a tenderness for error, and, on the other, treated with derision the great devotion that existed to the Mother of God, and other most cherished practices. These men, more fond of elegant turns of expression than of the "sound form of words," may be considered to be represented by the classical but un-Catholic Erasmus.*

* See the charges of Albertus Pius against Erasmus, as inserted

The influence of such a party, added to the effects of the long wars, was probably more or less injurious, although few of its traces are now perceptible. This is the more likely, because even Sir Thomas More's works, zealous as he was for the Church, remind one unpleasantly, when he speaks of the religious life, of his being the friend of Erasmus. Generally, however, both in writings and in the practices of daily life, the tone of morality and religion was healthy.* At all times, indeed, it has been one of the great objects of the Church to beat down vice. From the time when St. Paul had to reprove so sternly the infant churches of the Corinthians and Galatians, to the present day, this has been the most arduous employment of all zealous pastors. The Church in England at the beginning of the sixteenth century could not claim exemption from the general malady of human nature, but it was probably not below an average condition of good: certainly it still cherished the poor, educating and feeding them without the interference of the

in Raynaldi (A.D. 1516, Mansi's ed. 1755). Albertus was no enemy to men of letters; he was the warm defender of Reuclin, when the latter, one of the chief of the Humanists, was accused at Rome. It is true, Erasmus endeavoured to defend or explain away most of the charges alleged, when they were produced and condemned by the Faculty of Paris (see his Works, vol. ix. Lugd. Bat. p. 815, &c.); yet his defence was more ingenious than solid. One specimen strangely reminds us of Wickliffe's mode of reply. He had said, "I know not whether the Apostles' Creed was handed down by the Apostles." In his defence he said "scripto" was understood. This would make it—"I know not whether the Creed was handed down in writing by the Apostles:" a very different proposition, surely!

* Strype's account of the morals of the time rests upon the letter of Fox, yet goes far beyond what is stated in that letter,—a fault not unfrequent in this writer.—(Memorials, vol. i. p. 46; and Append. No. 10, and p. 18.) It is singular that the letter quoted by Strype is attributed, in the British Museum's Catalogue of the Cott. MSS., to Pace of Winchester, though with a note of interrogation, and is there stated to be addressed to Cranmer. The autograph itself contains no names except the signature, "Ri. Winton." Nor is the year given. It begins,—"Very Rev. Father and Lord." On the other hand, it speaks of "the favour and authority" both with the king and the Pope, enjoyed by the person to whom it is addressed: words quite inapplicable to Cranmer.

state; it still loved the sanctuary of God, and was especially devoted to the passion of Christ, and to the sorrows and joys of his Blessed Mother.* Polydore Vergil, an Italian, whose long residence in England made him perfectly familar with its people, quite incidentally, but emphatically, states, when writing of the times of Wolsey, that "the English people were by no means neglectful in matters of religion." †

* If we open the Chronicles, or the writings of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth century, and notice the incidental circumstances that faithfully reflect the manners of the people, we cannot fail to be struck by this twofold devotion. If a man meet with a sudden accident in the streets, he is not surrounded by a crowd drawn together by mere curiosity, but by persons whose first endeavour is to suggest to him thoughts of our Lord's sufferings, as a consolation greater than money or the hospital. Such an incident, one of many, is mentioned by Fabyan; and Fabyan's own Chronicle (he was an alderman of London) is a standing proof of devotion to Our Lady: it is divided into seven books, each book being dedicated to one of the Seven Joys of the Blessed Virgin.

† Pol. Verg. lib. 27, p. 66.

CHAPTER II.

STATE OF ENGLAND AT THE ACCESSION OF HENRY VIII.—CHARACTER OF THE NEW KING—HIS MARRIAGE WITH CATHERINE OF ARRAGON—ANNE BOLEYN—THE DIVORCE SUGGESTED—WHAT MATTERS RENDERED IT MORE FEASIBLE THAN USUAL—SUBSERVIENCY OF THE ENGLISH PRELATES AND BARONS—WOLSEY—STATE OF THE CONTINENT—LUTHER—HIS LETTER, AND THESES ON INDULGENCES—HIS INSINCERITY—OTHER REFORMERS—THEIR MUTUAL RECRIMINATIONS—THE REVOLT OF THE ANABAPTISTS—HENRY WRITES AGAINST LUTHER—RECEIVES FROM THE POPE THE TITLE OF DEFENDER OF THE FAITH—THE FIRST PLANS FOR SECURING THE DIVORCE—EMBASSIES—DISRESPECTFUL LANGUAGE OF GARDINER—FRUITLESS EFFORTS TO OBTAIN THE DECRETAL BULL, OR PREVIOUS CONFIRMATION OF SENTENCE—FURY OF HENRY—CAMPEGGIO JOINS WOLSEY IN THE TRIAL OF THE DIVORCE—THE SWEATING SICKNESS—HENRY'S PANIC AND RELAPSE—HIS SPEECH AT BRIDEWELL—THE TRIAL: NO CAUSE FOUND FOR THE DIVORCE—SUFFOLK'S INSOLENCE—WOLSEY'S REPLY—HIS DISGRACE AND DEATH—PERSECUTION OF CATHERINE.

At the accession of Henry VIII., the civil wars, and their sequel of mysterious conspiracies, as well as the French and Scottish wars, which had drained the national resources for two hundred years, were all completely at an end. Elated at the general prosperity, at his own new position, and at the flatteries too craftily administered and too greedily received, the young king surrendered his whole heart to the treacherous fascination. The display of pomp and power, always more or less necessary in order to excite respect and awe, became with the thoughtless Henry an extravagance as costly as war itself; whilst his love of pleasure, enduring no restraint, degenerated into the most vicious excesses; and being united to an unbending pride, plunged the whole nation into that state of schism from which it never afterwards fully emerged.

Henry was betrothed, some years before his accession, to his brother's widow, Catherine of Arragon, a dispensation for the espousals having been obtained from the Holy See. At the command of his father, however, whose motives were purely political, the young prince had afterwards made a formal protest against the match; but this he recalled, in an audience with the Spanish ambassador, immediately after his father's death; and, in a short time, he still more effectually annulled the protest, by a public marriage with Catherine, Archbishop Warham officiating. As Catherine had been married but a few months to Henry's youthful brother, and had made a solemn protest that she was still a virgin, it excited little surprise that Catherine's bridal costume and decorations were trappings of white cloth of gold, and the white robes and loosely flowing hair of a maiden.*

In the course of the eighteen following years, Catherine became the mother of five children; but, to Henry's bitter disappointment, they all died in their infancy, except one daughter, afterwards Queen Mary. During this period, Henry proved anything but a faithful husband. One of his illegitimate sons, the duke of Richmond, was educated and attended in the palace as if heir-apparent.

Among those ladies to whom Henry paid his attentions, was the too famous Anne Boleyn. She did not repel his advances altogether, but acting to perfection the part of a coquette, flitted unremittingly about

* Pol. Verg. l. 27, ad init.; Hall, i. Henry VIII. Hall was a contemporary writer, but exceedingly prejudiced. The latter part of his work was composed by Grafton, from Hall's notes.—(See Pref. to ed. of 1809.) Hall's Chronicle is dedicated to Edward VI.—Stowe. See also depositions of Fox and Warham in Herbert's Henry VIII. an. 1529. Warham's protest against the marriage, until the arrival of the Pope's dispensation, need not be supposed to have arisen from any doubt of the first degree of affinity being liable to the dispensing power of the Keys. It was his duty thus to speak until the dispensation was actually granted; and this the more, because it would seem from Pole's letter to Charles V., that the young prince was violently in love with Catherine, and was repeatedly demanding her in marriage.—Pole, Apol. 83 and 84.

him, whilst she signified that she would never be his mistress, although she was not unwilling to become his queen.

Whilst Henry was endeavouring to understand the meaning of this reply, it was suggested to him that a divorce from Catherine, on the ground of never having been her lawful husband, would enable him to marry Anne. Who it was that gave this advice it is not easy to learn. Some have supposed that it was the king of France, who hoped to make it the first step towards dissolving the alliance of England and Spain. Some point to Wolsey, as being anxious to revenge himself upon the emperor, who was Catherine's nephew. Cardinal Pole, in a letter to Henry, states, as a known fact, that Anne Boleyn herself suggested it, by means of certain friends at Court. This account is far more trustworthy than either of the former. It is corroborated, in some degree, by Campian's statement that some powerful families, having become infected with Lutheranism, wished to produce a quarrel between Henry, on the one side, and the Pope and emperor on the other.*

After all, the origin of the wish for the divorce is, comparatively, of little consequence. Not so the results of that wish: the effort to gratify it, and resentment that such an effort was fruitless, produced the schism already referred to, and prepared the way for the present Anglican Establishment.

Under a different combination of circumstances, indeed, the passions of a tyrant would never have been

* Sanders, 1610, p. 5; Pole's Epp. (Proem ad Reg. Sc.) par. i. p. 176; and Apol. ad Carl. v. Cæs. p. 162, Brix. 1744; Stowe; Camp.'s Divorce, p. 735 (Append. to Harpsf.); Strype's Memor. vol. i. p. 88. Stowe and Camp. were born in the reign of Henry VIII. Their testimony is scarcely contemporary, but is of great value, as embodying the ideas of those that were contemporary, and for being founded upon contemporary documents. Strype was not born till about a century after the divorce. His assertions are of no value, except when corroborated by the Memorials, or documents inserted in his Appendix. In his text he sometimes goes beyond his documents, his partiality being everywhere strikingly obvious.

so disastrous. The resistance of St. Anselm quelled the despotism of the first Norman princes. The blood of St. Thomas raised so indignant a cry throughout Europe, that Henry II. paused, and was ever after timid in his encroachments. Had the two archbishops been men of this stamp, Henry VIII. himself might have been baffled; but neither of them was found bold enough to speak, or, at all events, to act decidedly in favour of the oppressed Catherine.* If they could throw the odium of defending her upon the Pope, they were satisfied. The more zealous of the olden bishops were not reduced to silence, because money and royal compliments could raise a superficial doubt; they would point out to king or noble what they saw to be his duty, and yet would be ready to lay down their opinion at the feet of St. Peter's successor. The bishops were now, alas! courtiers, men of the world, who knew the wiles of statesmanship, who were learned in languages, in history, in law, in the art of governing; who, in short, were ornaments to the king and his court; but were, for the most part, strangers to the independence of Christian pastors. The king, whose very instincts were despotic, must have been gratified indeed as he looked around upon his magnificent court. The highest of the land were there, and all obsequious. The spirit of the old baronage was departed: there was not one to assume the tone, honest though rough, of a man who bore himself as a freeman, and almost as an equal, and dared to criticise and reprove, and sometimes resist. But to find even the prelates of the same pliant disposition, this must have been the crown of such a ruler's joy.

Wolsey himself, by whom, from his position and his dignity as cardinal and legate, the battle ought to have been fought, perhaps even more than by Warham, owed his advancement to the see of York, in great

* Harpsfeld, indeed, assures us that Warham "constantly opposed the divorce" (p. 632); but, if so, it was too feebly expressed to give real weight to the cause of justice. Warham was Wolsey's predecessor in the chancellorship.

measure, to the king's favour; and appears to have been too much in love with the world to withstand his royal master, even for his royal master's salvation. He spoke, indeed, once or twice of the king's duty, but not until the opportunity had passed, and not with the energy of one who was thoroughly in earnest. A glance at his earlier career will explain his position, but cannot justify his obsequious conduct. At the close of Henry VII.'s reign, Fox of Winchester and the earl of Surrey were in opposition. They naturally sought to strengthen themselves by engaging on their side young men of conspicuous talent. Such a one was the still youthful priest, Thomas Wolsey. His family was not indeed noble, being plain but wealthy burghers of Ipswich; but his learning, energy, and talents were already manifest. Fox, therefore, if he were not the first to introduce him, certainly drew upon him the especial attention of Henry VII.* His diligence confirmed this recommendation, and soon procured for him the office of dean of Lincoln. Henry VIII. soon after became king, and, with many faults, was yet sagacious, witty, and well educated. He found in Wolsey a congenial mind. He made him his minister and canon of Windsor, then bishop of Lincoln, and finally archbishop of York. Thus elevated, Wolsey became but too faithful an imitator of Henry's other courtiers. His faults, indeed, were few, and his virtues many, but he wanted the heroism

* Cavendish, Pol. Ver. p. 18, Leyden, 1651; Fiddes's Wolsey, p. 4, &c. Lingard is inclined to treat Polydore's account "as a fiction," but, it seems to me, on insufficient grounds. It must be admitted, on the other hand, that Polydore's account ought to be received with great caution. When a minister has fallen, and those that have cast him down are in power, few are they that dare to speak the truth. Polydore, besides, had received a benefice, and in order to retain it, acknowledged the king's supremacy: scarcely would such a one displease the king for the sake of praising an enemy; for, to add to all these motives to speak harshly of Wolsey, there was a personal feeling; Polydore, when sub-collector for the Pope's dues, had been imprisoned for several months under Wolsey's administration, A.D. 1515.—Fiddes's Collect. p. 16.

by which St. Thomas could sacrifice at once a king's favour and his own peace and life.

Had the obsequiousness of his nobles and prelates, however, been Henry's sole encouragement, he would hardly have dared to press his suit, but, unhappily, whilst everything in England seemed to hang upon his nod, the state of the Continent, resounding with war and new-born heresy, seemed equally favourable to the attainment of his desires. The king of Hungary was involved in that struggle with the Turks in which he speedily perished; France, exhausted by its struggle with the empire and Spain, had just submitted to humiliating terms, in order to receive back its captive monarch; and Italy, having at the call of the Pope combined for its common independence, was sinking beneath the might of the united king and emperor Charles V.

In the midst of this confusion, Luther and twenty other self-appointed leaders of reformation were writing and preaching superficial but fiery invectives, sometimes against one another, and sometimes against the Catholic Church.

Luther was now no longer, as before, an Augustinian monk. Falsifying the text of St. Paul to the Romans, he had raised the cry of Faith *alone;* and, as if to prove how little he valued works, whether "of the law" or of grace, he had cast away his habit and the self-denying rules of his order, and had married a nun, despite of his solemn vows. Years before this, he had shown such a love of new opinions as to attract animadversion. He heeded not: subtle, vehement, wordy, he dearly loved that gloss of novelty which attracts the unthinking multitude. Amongst his other assertions was his singular one regarding passive submission to the Turks, who were carrying desolation into the centre of Europe: they were the scourge of God, and therefore ought not to be resisted! *

* Audin and Rinaldi, passim.

He had begun his career as an open enemy of the Church as early as A.D. 1517. With a zeal worthy of commendation, were it sincere, he wrote to the archbishop of Mayence to call his attention to some abuses in the preaching of indulgences. That such abuses should have existed can excite no surprise: tares will ever be found springing up amongst the good grain. It was not, however, the abuses, it was the doctrine that was the real object of attack. In Luther's epistle to the archbishop, he took upon himself to request him to enjoin a different method of promulgating the indulgences, if he would not see some treatises published which would redound to the archbishop's discredit. That such treatises should ever be published, Luther declared was a thing of which he had "the greatest horror," and yet he had already prepared those very treatises, and that very night affixed them to the gates of the principal church of Wittemberg. In these treatises, or theses, he attacked not the abuses, but the doctrine, of indulgences. Summoned to Rome, he excused himself from making his appearance, but promised obedience to the Pope's decision: "Your voice," he wrote, "I will acknowledge as the voice of Christ presiding and speaking in you." Yet, in almost the same breath, he writes to Prierio, the master of the Sacred Palace, that Rome was "the synagogue of Satan, the seat of Antichrist;" * adding that "all who hold communion with it are doomed to perdition." Soon afterwards, in a conference with Cardinal Cajetan, he again contradicted his own words: he now avowed himself ready to "reverence and follow the Roman Church in all his words and facts, present, past, and future."

The inconsistency marks not only the behaviour, but the doctrines of Luther. It is, indeed, somewhat disguised by a style and tone always decisive, often scurrilous, and often vehement even to fury;† yet, to

* See the letters in his Works, tom. i. pp. 100 and 189; Witeburgæ, 1545. See also Raynaldi, an. 1527.

† In a work which treats only incidentally of continental occur-

one not dazzled by words, the inconsistency is everywhere glaringly conspicuous. There was more than inconsistency: can it be believed, there was the audacity to avow that the evil one was sometimes his adviser? Let the edition of his own works, which was begun under his own eye, and was completed by his disciples, be consulted, and what does the reader think he will there meet with? Not only that private masses were to be abolished, and that by the advice of the enemy of our salvation, but he will meet with a prolonged dialogue, which Luther asserts that he held with the devil upon this subject! *

Such was the man, whether mad or most wicked, who raised the standard of revolt against the Church, and, pretending to help man's feeble reason, broke the staff of authority on which it leaned. Great was the surprise of this new teacher to find that his views of the word of God were not always received by those who had, at first, applauded his doctrines: great was his indignation that they should, like himself, propound new articles of belief; and numerous, therefore, were the pamphlets full of threats and anathemas that passed between him and Zuinglius and Œcolampadius,

rences, quotations to prove the assertions in the text need scarcely be alleged; and the more, because this furious vehemence is generally admitted, in regard both to Luther and to the other reformers. To remove, however, the blame included in such an admission, D'Israeli and other modern writers have ascribed Luther's scurrility to the rude character of the age, asserting that it was the characteristic of Catholic no less than of Protestant writers. Those that make such an assertion have evidently read but little of the Catholic writers of that age. Let those that have opportunity judge for themselves, whether it was so, not as an exception, but as a general rule. Let others at least hesitate before they are led away by what appears to be a candid admission, but which, after all, is an admission made by Protestants, and of no value, except as far as Protestants themselves are concerned. The statement, meanwhile, of one who is a Protestant clergyman, and librarian to the late archbishop of Canterbury—a man of no common research—ought to be conclusive:—"The Romish writers" did "abstain from that fierce, truculent, and abusive language, and that loathsome ribaldry of the Puritan writers."—Maitland's Essays on the Reformation, p. 48.

* De Missâ Privatâ and Unc. Sacerd. pp. 228, &c. 1558.

whose chief opposition to Luther was their denial not only of the efficacy of private masses, but of his new teaching of consubstantiation, or indeed of any kind of real presence. Many sects thus arose; fanaticism gathered strength, and of the elect, as the reformers choose to consider themselves, many, and particularly the anabaptists, saw not why they should submit to any earthly rule, either spiritual or temporal. The idea suited a time when feudalism was breaking up; and, therefore, many who knew nothing else of the new teaching joined their ranks, and they speedily broke into open rebellion. Three hundred thousand armed men were thus let loose upon Germany; not to vanquish and have mercy, but to burn and slay, with blood of old and young on their hands and religion on their lips. The nobles, the burghers, all who had anything at stake, after the first heavings of terror, saw that they must die on their own hearths, or issue forth to a desperate encounter. They took heart, and, amidst burning towns and ruined castles, they struggled on until, in the blood of one hundred thousand men, they extinguished, for a time, this first outbreak of puritanical violence (A.D. 1525).

When the cry of war had died away, the strife of hostile sects continued. England, meantime, was watching with astonishment the agitation and confusion of Germany. Some of its ablest men joined in the conflict against heresy. Henry VIII. himself, assisted, it is thought, by Wolsey, and Fisher the bishop of Rochester, and Sir Thomas More, wrote a treatise upon the Seven Sacraments, against Luther. The latter speedily answered, never being at a loss, if not for arguments, at least for fiery words. His answer was replied to by Sir Thomas More. Again he took up the pen: "I care not," he wrote, "if a thousand Augustines, a thousand Cyprians, a thousand Henrician Churches, stand against me. God cannot err or deceive. Augustine and Cyprian, like all the elect, can err and have erred." Yet Luther himself, one would think, could not err.

It was in acknowledgment of this defence of the Church's doctrine, that Henry received from the Pope, what his successors have tenaciously retained, the title of "Defender of the Faith." It appears that, some time before writing the treatise, he had sued for the title of "Most Christian," which Julius II. had threatened to withdraw from the schismatical Louis XII. Disappointed in this, he presented his treatise to Leo X. for his examination and approval, and petitioned for the other title, promising to be equally zealous against Luther's followers in England as against Luther himself. It was granted after "mature deliberation," by Leo in 1521, and again by Clement in 1524. *

Such was the favourable conjuncture of affairs both in England and on the Continent, when Henry understood the full meaning of Anne Boleyn's words, and began to strive in earnest for so unheard of a divorce. He knew, indeed, that Julius II. had granted a full dispensation for his marriage with Catherine, even if the marriage with his brother Arthur had been consummated; and he might easily have learned that it was by no means the first dispensation of the kind. As a Catholic, therefore, he could have no reasonable doubt of the past, nor a reasonable hope of the future; yet on he pressed, impatient of all control. He ought to have remembered the words with which Julius's bull of dispensation closes: "Let no man, therefore, infringe in any way this record of our absolution, dispensation, and will, or by any rash attempt contract it. Should any one presume to make such an attempt, let him know that he will incur the indignation of Almighty God, and of His Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul" (A.D. 1503). Would it be too much to say that the fulfilment of this sentence is written

* Rayn. an. 1521, p. 381; Luth. Opera, tom. ii. pp. 355, 535, &c.; Camp. Divorce; Rymer, vols. xiii. and xiv. See also the letter of Cardinal Bambridge, Wolsey's predecessor in the see of York, in Fid. Coll. p. 12; as well as Herbert's remarks at the time of Rochester's execution (Henry VIII. A.D. 1535).

in all the closing acts of Henry's reign, in the speedy extinction of his race, and in the pregnant brood of evils which he has bequeathed to the English Church and nation? Heedless, however, of all things but the gratification of his passions, he was now moving heaven and earth to secure his "secret" or "great" matter, as he and his agents generally termed the divorce.

As Rome had recently fallen into the hands of the mercenaries of Charles V., and had been cruelly sacked, and as the Pope himself had become a prisoner, Henry fancied that if he protested against the acts of a captive pope, he might securely prosecute a divorce in England.

This project, however, was abandoned. The penetration of Henry must have perceived the half-concealed reluctance of some of his chief counsellors. Wolsey, as soon as he heard the king avow his determination to marry, not as he himself wished a foreign princess, but Anne Boleyn, entreated him to abandon the idea, although, courtier-like, he afterwards toiled for his master's object. The great lawyer, Sir Thomas More, renowned for his independence when speaker of the House of Commons, and who was now treasurer of the household, being asked his opinion upon the divorce, and being afterwards again and again questioned, calmly but insidiously, upon the same subject, long evaded a direct answer; and when still pressed, made but this brief reply, "Divers points a great way pass my learning." The bishops, when asked their opinion, thought, or at least said, that there was sufficient reason for consulting the Holy See; but the bishop of Rochester ventured to declare their assertion groundless, while the doctors, both of civil and canon law, were unanimous in their opinion of the validity of the marriage. Whatever weight these answers might have had with the king, his first plan was overthrown by the news of the Pope's escape from confinement.*

* Burn. Ref. Records, vol. i. l. 2, No. i.; Strype's Mem. App. to

The king was obliged, therefore, to have recourse to an embassy. Its object was to obtain permission for Wolsey to institute and direct a commission of inquiry into the dispensation, and to secure another dispensation,* in case the former marriage proved invalid. For these purposes the king's agents were despatched with strict orders to spare nothing; to use promises, money, intimidation. Well did they fulfil their task; but in their chief object, in extorting immediate consent to a divorce, they signally failed. The Pope, however, permitted the cause to be tried and decided either by Wolsey or by Cardinal Staphilæus, dean of the Rota, who was then in England, and in whom Henry had much confidence. He also granted a dispensation to the king, in case of a divorce being pronounced, to marry any person, even if she were in the first degree of affinity. As these ample concessions were insufficient for Henry's purpose, a second embassy was sent. It consisted, amongst others, of Stephen Gardiner, the Secretary of Wolsey, and Edward Fox, provost of King's College, Cambridge, who, being the royal almoner, is significantly termed by Strype, "the king's servant."

They found the Pope at Orvieto, in a state of complete destitution, if we may credit Gardiner's despatches. The three rooms through which they

vol. i. No. 48; Cavend. Henry, amongst his other pleas for a divorce, alleged his first protest, made by his father's command. Yet, as Warham remarked, such a protest was useless until Henry had attained the age of puberty. The dispensation nevertheless remained good at all events; he might refuse to make use of it, but a dispensation it still was, and as such was unhesitatingly acted upon by himself as soon as he mounted the throne.

* This other dispensation, applied for at such a time, evidently refers to Anne Boleyn; and as it was to relax the impediment of even the first degree of affinity, it points to the known fact of Mary Boleyn, Anne's sister, having been the royal concubine. What a face of brass must Henry have had, to pretend to have a scruple at the supposition (for, at the best, there was anything but certainty) of being within the first degree of affinity to his queen Catherine, and yet having none to enter upon a marriage with Anne Boleyn, whom he knew well, through his own sinful connection with her sister Mary, to be in that very same first degree of affinity.

passed were devoid of furniture, and encumbered with fragments of their shattered roofs. Such was the condition to which the late sack of Rome had reduced his Holiness. Nor was this all: hunger and every inconvenience of extreme poverty afflicted him and his little court.

Nothing could be more encouraging to the English envoys. They had money: how could it be refused under the circumstances? To their surprise, however, it was refused; calmly indeed, but resolutely. The Cardinal Santi Quatri was the person whose influence they chiefly coveted. The former embassy had failed to shake his integrity by the offer of a large sum of money. The present embassy was, therefore, instructed to discover his peculiar tastes, in order to ascertain whether he might be accessible to presents of another kind. The cardinal, however, was true to himself and the Church.

Seeing that the Pope was not inclined to dispense with the various forms through which so important a question had to pass, and seeing, too, that there was little prospect of ultimate success, Gardiner forgot his respect for the chair of St. Peter, and warmly urged upon the Pope "to have good regard unto the king's sentiments upon this his dealing, and stop the occasion that was flying by, and endeavour to retain the king's devotion towards the See Apostolic, and not put things in such condition, as they should not be recoverable by any means hereafter." * The Pope overlooked the insolence of such remarks: "heard him patiently," says Stowe. The poor Pope saw, in his mind, the grim features of three crowned heads all threatening. If he leaned to Henry, Charles was pointing to the pillage of Rome, while Francis was biding his time, not unmindful of his own expulsion from Italy. With such a vision before his eyes, the words "retain the king's devotion," must have called up an additional spectre — Germany and

* Strype's Memor. vol. i. chap. ix. p. 88, &c. and Append.; Cavendish; Records in Burnet, vol. i. book ii. No. 3, &c.

Switzerland full of confusion and heresy. In the midst of these calculations, more or less of the earth, Clement had to fix his eyes upon that other king, whose vicar in this lower world he was. With such complex thoughts in his mind, he perhaps scarcely heeded the intemperate speech that fell half-deadened upon his ears: he heard it patiently. And yet, perhaps, the spirit of an Innocent III. would have been more suitable, and might have recalled Gardiner to his senses. Yet, who shall say?

In the proceedings that followed, a treatise, embodying Henry's reasons for the divorce, was produced. Its words were carefully weighed, but were inconclusive. The objections to the bull of dispensation, as being obtained surreptitiously and without Henry's knowledge, were frivolous, being evidently contrary to fact. The text so continually quoted by the king's agents from Leviticus, that "He that marrieth his brother's wife doth an unlawful thing," implied nothing contrary to the dispensation, since it implied nothing contrary to the law of nature, nor to the commandments of God, a passage in Deuteronomy permitting, and even commanding, such a marriage: "When brethren dwell together, and one of them dieth without children, the wife of the deceased shall not marry to another, but his brother shall take her, and shall raise up seed for his brother."

Gardiner, however, was full of resources: answered on one point, he clung to another. He knew how eagerly the king and the friends of Anne Boleyn were watching his efforts; and he contended for victory with equal skill and hardihood. He had, at first, requested a "Decretal Bull," giving, beforehand, the Pope's confirmation of the sentence of the two cardinals. This unprecedented demand the Pope firmly refused. He could not, in common justice, he replied, until he had heard "the other party;" and the cardinals had already remarked that a sick man ought not to prescribe for himself, but to obey his physicians.*

* Strype's Mem. i. pp. 101 and 104, and the despatches in the

Baffled on these points, Gardiner struggled on. He now fastened upon Julius II.'s dispensation: Henry, he observed, was at the time scarcely aware of its existence; some of its reasons, moreover, were not true. Trying, in short, all the arts of a special pleader, and having already hinted most offensively at Luther's burning publicly a copy of the canon law, this thorough courtier added, "However the king had hitherto exploded the suit of some, yet now he would begin to be not displeased at it: viz., that the Pope's laws were fit to be committed to the flames, which were uncertain even to the Pope himself, and those that belonged to him." Similar threats, mingled with a high flown strain about Henry's services, were now again employed.

The final result was, that the Pope allowed an inquiry to be made into the fact of the due formality of the dispensation, and the consequent validity of the marriage. This was received as a triumph. It was conveyed to England by Fox himself; and, by Henry's own direction, was by him communicated in the first place, not to the king, but, with no slight want of delicacy, to Anne Boleyn, and that too in her own chamber. Wolsey trembled at the news. He was too clear-sighted to doubt the validity of the dispensation; and if he were appointed to decide, and yet pronounced in favour of it, his earthly ruin was sealed. He, therefore, urged Gardiner, who was still at Rome, to press still more for the "Decretal Commission," as well as for the Pope's own declaration that Julius's dispensation was either valid or invalid. On this cause, he wrote, depend "the wealth or ruin of this realm, the conservation of his (Wolsey's) honour or else his immortal ignominy and slander, the damnation of his soul or his everlasting merit."

Henry himself was growing not only impatient,

App. No. xxiii. &c. p. 46, &c. See also Le Grand, p. 83, &c. For a pithy account of Burnet's dishonesty in his narrative of these negotiations, see the Life of Wolsey by Fiddes (a Protestant clergyman), p. 462.

but furious. The Pope had cautioned him, from the beginning, that he was taking a course that would necessarily occupy a considerable time; but that if he were indeed satisfied in his own conscience, his plan should be to marry at once. The question would then be so simplified, that the Holy See could pronounce sentence without delay.

Henry, however, persisted in following his own course. Great was his vexation when he found that the Pope firmly refused the bull so pertinaciously contended for. "Shall we spend," broke out this most considerate ruler, "our treasure, to the impoverishing ourselves, our realm, and subjects? Shall we yet entertain battle and hostility with our friends for his sake? who after marvellous importune suit and instance, would only give out such a commission, as he might revoke again, and inhibit at his pleasure, leaving in the same such remedies of appellation and other delays to the adversary, as though he seemed nothing less to intend, but to involve and cast us so in the briars and fetters, that we should hang always under his yoke and bondage."*

Urged by Wolsey's letters, and by what he heard regarding Henry, Gardiner once more exerted himself to procure the "Decretal Bull." As if wearied out by importunity and threats, the Pope, in some degree, yielded. He drew up and signed the bull; but having selected Cardinal Campeggio as Wolsey's assessor in judging the cause, he confided the document to his care, charging him strictly never to let it go out of his own hands, and after having read it to the king and cardinal, to destroy it in private.

Charles V., the nephew of Catherine, had, meantime, laboured to undermine the influence of Gar-

* Cavendish; Strype, i. pp. 108 and 109, and Append. No. xxiv. xxv. and xxvi.; Le Grand's Hist. of the Divorce (p. 79), quoting Cassali's Lett. &c. Le Grand wrote at the time of the English Revolution. His work is of peculiar value; one part being a faithful abridgment and arrangement of the numerous contemporary documents, which he has collected in a separate volume.

diner; and for this purpose, opposed everything Henry claimed, and scarcely fell short of the English monarch in his disrespectful hints and open menaces.

Clement, therefore, directed Campeggio to gain as much time as possible; and after hearing the cause, to refrain from giving judgment until he had referred to the Holy See. Campeggio, who in early life had been married, and had now been cardinal for eleven years, was a man of firmness and sagacity, well acquainted with the wiles of courts. On his arrival in England, he was visited daily by Wolsey, and often by Henry. His son was knighted. He himself had already received the bishopric of Salisbury, and now was promised the rich bishopric of Durham. All these, and a hundred other dazzling attentions, he well understood. He was prepared to see all vanish, and to meet with frowns and insults, in their place; but he was determined to do his duty. He made it his first object, to the no small alarm of Wolsey, to persuade Henry to abandon all thoughts of a divorce; quite against the king's "expectation and my hope," wrote his amazed coadjutor. Failing in this attempt, Campeggio had no alternative but to prepare for a full examination of the documents and witnesses of this extraordinary suit.

The citizens of London, and indeed the people in general, had been at no pains to conceal their dislike of all these proceedings. Even in the previous year, their disapprobation of a divorce was so plainly uttered, that Henry commanded the lord mayor to put an end to all such expressions of opinion. When, however, it became evident that Anne Boleyn was the party for whom a divorce was sought, the feeling grew stronger than before.

Presently the Sweating Sickness broke out, and men must have smiled to see the haste with which Henry dismissed Anne to her father's house, whilst he himself joined again, both in bed and board, his injured queen; and, lodging at the abbey of St. Alban's, united with her in devotional exercises, "confessing

every day, and receiving communion every festival" (June, 1528). His terrors, however, speedily abated: he saw that few died in proportion to the number seized, and before the end of the month he had resumed his correspondence with Anne.

The "sickness" passed, and again was Anne to be seen at court, paraded about, on all occasions, by the infatuated monarch. People no longer refrained from open murmurs. The women were particularly free and loud in their remarks. The long and short of the matter was, they said, that the king wanted another wife for his own pleasure, and for no other reason.

Despotic as the Tudors were, they loved popularity. Henry, therefore, called around him, in his palace of Bridewell, the peers of his council and the judges, and then, sending for the lord mayor and the chief of the citizens, addressed them all upon the shortness and uncertainty of life, upon the happiness of an undisturbed succession, and upon the troubled state of his own conscience in consequence of having married his brother's wife. He assured them that the hand of his daughter Mary had been rejected by the French, because some of their counsellors, and especially the bishop of Tarbes, doubted her legitimacy; and, "on the word of a prince," declared, that he had taken counsel "to settle my conscience, and for none other cause, as God can judge." He concluded with telling them that he had in consequence consulted the Pope, and would abide by the decision of the two cardinals; and that, in short, as they valued their heads, they had better be silent. The assembly broke up, not altogether satisfied.*

The assertion that the French rejected the hand of Mary, was one of those reckless untruths in which

* See his love-letters in Tierney's Dodd, i. No. 14. Some of the letters are so gross that no woman of genuine propriety would have received them. Cavendish, State Papers, vol. vii. p. 223; Stowe, who closely copies Cavendish and Hall; the Bish. of Bayonne's lett. in Le Grand's "Proofs," Nos. 19 and 20, &c. pp. 152 and 164, &c.; Le Gr.'s Divorce, p. 97, 104, &c.

Henry is often detected: in the negotiations recently concluded with France, Mary's hand is always sought by the French. In an early stage of those negotiations, the bishop of Tarbes, the French ambassador, did indeed ask whether Mary's legitimacy was unimpeached; but this he was believed at the time to have done at the suggestion either of Wolsey or of Henry. The hand of Mary was sought no less eagerly after, than before, this crafty question.

The solemn terms in which the king declared that his efforts for the divorce were to settle his conscience, and for "none other cause," sadly remind one that rank, whatever its outward pretensions, is not always connected with honour and integrity. What was the meaning of Henry's urgent directions to his envoys at Rome to ask, not for the solution of a difficulty, but for the divorce? What was the meaning of Gardiner's threats, and his bitter caution to Clement, "to have good regard unto the king's sentiments upon this his dealing," and to "endeavour to retain the king's devotion towards the See Apostolic?" Does all this appear like an application for an impartial judgment? Why did he so earnestly press for the Decretal Bull, that so he might make sure of the divorce, and that quickly, and without giving his poor queen the power to appeal?

The very instructions which the king was now sending to his agents at Rome, show what kind of a conscience it was that had dictated his prolonged efforts.* Campeggio had read the Decretal Bull, as he

* At the beginning of the long negotiations with the Holy See (Sept. 13th, 1527), Knight was employed by the king on what that agent terms "your secret affair, which is to me only committed." Three months later, Wolsey's instructions to Casale speak continually, not of the solution of a case of conscience, but of the king's object, the king's petition, that which is fixed most deeply in the king's heart. If the king's object cannot be easily secured, his agents were to reveal the secret maladies of the queen. On the 29th December, 1527, when the king's "secret" was widely known, Wolsey's instructions speak out plainly: the king requires a "dissolution" of the marriage.—See the various docum. in State Papers, vol. vii. pp. 167—185.

had been instructed. He was requested to read it before the privy council, but was firm in his refusal. The king, therefore, deferred the trial, in hopes of obtaining from Clement what had been refused by his legate; but Clement only lamented his weakness in having yielded so far. Finding his efforts baffled, the king issued to certain canonists employed by him at Rome, three questions or cases, which clearly betrayed what he had studiously sought to disguise.

The first was whether a husband whose wife had made a vow of chastity and entered a convent could be authorized by the Pope to marry again? The second was whether a husband who, as well as his wife, had entered the religious state, could not be released from his monastic vows and allowed to marry again? The third was whether, for reasons of state, a king could not be allowed by the Pope to have two wives at the same time, allowing to one only the honours of royalty? The whole object of these questions was for the king to be allowed, not to free himself from reasonable qualms, but to marry again.

All such negotiations having failed, the long expected trial was at last begun. It led to no results, for the king had no additional facts or reasons to produce, and no proof whatever of the main object, the invalidity of the marriage. He, indeed, sought to establish this position, on the ground that Catherine's marriage with Arthur had been consummated, and that the bull of Julius II. had been obtained under false pretences.

These, however, were bare assertions. Catherine, on the other hand, kneeling before the king, appealed to his conscience whether she had not always been a dutiful wife, and whether at their marriage she was not "a very maid." After this address, which made a profound impression upon the court, she withdrew, and never again appeared in public.

Henry made no reply upon the chief point, but having testified that Catherine had always been a dutiful wife, spoke, as he had already publicly done,

upon the uneasiness of his conscience (which ought indeed to have been intolerable enough).

The king's lawyers at length called for judgment (A.D. 1529). Henry was seated opposite the cardinals; and the duke of Suffolk was at his side, with a brief speech ready concocted, in case of an unfavourable decision. There seems to have been in the air or general attitude of the king's party something extremely menacing. The lofty terms in which judgment had been rather claimed than requested, added to the silent effect of a tyrant's glance.

Campeggio, however, was not easily moved: he saw the utter want of proof on the king's part, he remembered his own instructions, and he was aware that Catherine's appeal had been received at Rome. He observed, therefore, that it would be necessary to lay the proceedings before the Pope: until that had been done, judgment could not be pronounced. I come, he added, to administer justice. "I come not to plead for favour, meed, or dread of any person alive, be he king or otherwise. I have no such respect to the person that I will offend my conscience. I am an old man, both weak and sickly, that look daily for death."

The duke of Suffolk now advanced with his preconcerted speech. He struck the table before him, and exclaimed, that the old proverb had come true: "Never did cardinal bring good to England." * "Sir," replied Wolsey, whose spirit was aroused, but who retained a calm dignity, "of all men within this realm, ye have least cause to dispraise or be offended with cardinals: for if I, simple cardinal, had not been, you should have had at this present no head upon your shoulders, wherein you should have a tongue to

* Cavendish; Le Gr.'s "Preuves," No. 26; Herb.'s Henry VIII. p. 232, &c. Hall, whose partiality is obvious, represents not only "all the temporal lords" as breaking up on these words, but as leaving the cardinals gazing at each other in mute astonishment: it is one of those passages not unfrequent in our own days, in which a portion of the truth is sacrificed to a theatrical effect (21st year Henry VIII.).

make any such report in despight of us, who intend you no manner of displeasure; nor have we given you any occasion with such despight to be revenged with your hault words. I would ye knew it, my lord, that I and my brother here intendeth the king and his realm as much honour, wealth, and quietness, as you or any other, of what estate or degree soever he may be, within this realm; and would as gladly accomplish his lawful desire as the poorest subject he hath. But, my lord, I pray you, show me what ye would do if ye were the king's commissioner in a foreign region, having a weighty matter to treat upon: and the conclusion being doubtful thereof, would ye not advertise the king's majesty or ever ye went through the same? Yes, yes, my lord, I doubt not. Therefore, I would ye should banish your hasty malice and despight out of your heart, and consider that we be but commissioners for a time, and can, ne may not, by virtue of our commission proceed to judgment, without the knowledge and consent of the chief head of our authority, and having his consent to the same; which is the Pope. Therefore we do no less nor otherwise than our warrant will bear us; and if any man will be offended with us therefore, he is an unwise man. Wherefore, my lord, hold your peace, and pacify yourself, and frame your tongue like a man of honour and of wisdom, and not to speak so quickly or reproachfully by your friends; for ye know best what friendship ye have received at my hands, the which I yet never revealed to no person alive before now, neither to my glory, nor to your dishonour." "And therewith," adds Cavendish, "the duke gave over the matter without any words to reply; and so departed, and followed after the king, who was gone into Bridewell at the beginning of the duke's first words." *

Scarcely was the trial thus concluded, when Henry began to wreak his vengeance upon all that had

* Geo. Cavendish's Life of Wolsey, pp. 168—170, Singer's ed. Chiswick, 1825.

opposed his wishes. Campeggio was allowed to depart for Italy, but not until he had been subjected to the insult of a search; being maliciously accused of being laden with vast treasures. The search only disclosed the poverty of this incorruptible judge. The insult was, perhaps, meant, as some have supposed, to terminate in the seizure either of the Decretal Bull or of Henry's love letters to Anne. The cardinal, obedient to the Pope's injunctions, had destroyed the Decretal Bull; and Henry, as appears from his subsequent complaint to Clement, was aware of the fact. The letters then were more probably his object: they would prove that passion, not conscience, had urged him to sue for the divorce. They had been already despatched to Rome; and thus the king's meanness was deservedly punished.

Wolsey, of course, was a marked man. He was deprived of office, and prosecuted for having, contrary to the præmunire statutes, exercised his legatine commission. The object, as Cavendish observes, was to seize the wealth which the cardinal had collected for the endowment of his new colleges. This being achieved by the cardinal's prompt and even abject submission, the wrath of Henry would soon have been satiated, had it not been for the hatred and jealousy of the faction of the Boleyns. Anne and her friends had never shown a friendly feeling towards the cardinal, except for the brief interval when the Sweating Sickness made them tremble for their influence. But now was the hour of triumph. Even before the trial, Anne had had state apartments allotted to her, close beside those of the king; and the tongue of scandal was busy enough, and, unfortunately, with more reason than usual. The courtiers were directed to show her great attention; and, as if to give another proof of their utter servility, they flocked to the levees of Anne in greater crowds than to those of Catherine. When the latter was unfeelingly cast out, the Boleyns for a time swayed the king at their pleasure. They saw with joy the dismissal of Wolsey from the chancellor-

ship; but they were alarmed when they heard, that the cardinal's health having given way, the king had sent him his own physician. Nothing would satisfy them now but the cardinal's complete banishment from court. Even that, and a crowd of petty annoyances, was insufficient: he was arrested near York, on a charge of high treason.

His spirit, however, was already broken: he had tamed down his soul to the earth, and when it knew from experience what it ought to have known from faith, the vanity of earth, it pined away. He was led back towards London by the constable of the Tower, but at Leicester Abbey, he felt that his end was approaching; and bitter were his dying lamentations that he had served the earthly more zealously than the heavenly king. Thus closed the career of this powerful minister (Nov. 29, 1530). He was munificent, and was gifted with great natural abilities; but the Church of God can say, it is to be feared, but little in his praise. That he erected two colleges, one at Ipswich and the other at Oxford, by the suppression of a considerable number of the minor religious houses, it may perhaps not only overlook, but since the suppressed houses were almost forsaken, since the transfer of the funds was duly made by the Pope's permission, and since where seminaries are wanting the Council of Trent has commanded a similar suppression, such an act, if indispensably necessary, may even be praised. But one great fault must not be overlooked. By the præmunire and other statutes, the kings had so shut up the Church in this country against the correcting influence of the Holy See, that except through Wolsey, that influence could find but few inlets; and yet Wolsey, it appears, shut out, rather than admitted. The popes were fully occupied with heresy; and a legate ought to have been the eye and hand of the Holy See. Yet where does Wolsey apply for help to reform the abuses that are, for ever, springing up amongst even the children of the Church? So far from this, Wolsey was well aware that none

needed visitation and correction more than himself. If his morals were more irreproachable than some after his death chose to say, what excuse shall we find for one who held at his fall the sees of York, Durham, and Winchester; as well as the abbey of St. Alban's, and various other religious houses?*

The hatred which had thus pursued and overwhelmed the cardinal, did not spare even the heart-broken Catherine. As soon as the proceedings at Blackfriars were over, she was ordered to quit the palace. Having withdrawn to Greenwich, she was, after some time, again disturbed: several peers waited upon her, and asked her, on the part of the king, whether she would, "for the quietness of the king's conscience," submit the whole question to the decision of eight peers, four spiritual and four temporal, or "abide by her appeal?" The former alternative would now be a direct act of contempt of the Pope's jurisdiction. Catherine knew both her duty and her rights: her answer was prompt and decisive: "The king my father," she said, "I am sure, was not so ignorant but he asked counsel of clerks and well learned men before he married me the second time: for if he had had any doubt in my marriage, he would not have disbursed so great treasure as he did; and then all doctors in manner agreed my marriage to be good, insomuch that the Pope himself, which knew best what was to be done, did both dispense and ratified my second marriage. This shall be your answer, that I say I am his lawful wife, and in that point I will abide till the court of Rome have made thereof a final ending." Both the king and queen, soon after, withdrew to Windsor. There Henry left her, withdrawing to Woodstock (July 14), and never again

* Cavend. p. 209, &c.; Fiddes, Collect. No. 75, &c.; Pole's Apol. ad Cæs. p. 126; Pol. Verg.; Camp. Divorce, ad Calc. Harpsf. p. 736; the bish. of Bayonne's Lett. in Le Grand, iii. p. 231, &c. and passim. For Wolsey's courtier-like surrender of "the revenues" and "advantages of all spiritual things" in the see of Winchester, and his "interest and title" in the abbey of St. Alban's, &c. &c., see the agreement in Rymer, vi. p. 147.

approached her: "wherefore," says Hall, "the common people daily murmured." A second message having failed to shake her purpose, she received a mandate to quit Windsor. When she had obeyed, she was, after some time, followed by the duke of Suffolk, who charged her with disturbing the king and kingdom, by prosecuting her appeal at the Holy See, and thus by procuring sentence of excommunication against him. He then dismissed the greater part of her household, because, in reality, they had been too faithful to the cause of their injured mistress.*

* Hall, pp. 200 and 219, ed. of 1548, 23rd, &c. of Hen. VIII. (dedicated to Edward VI., and of course made palatable to Cranmer and the Seymours). Cavendish's account will scarcely coincide with Hall's. As soon as Campeggio had declared that the question was to be decided at Rome, "the king commanded the queen to be removed out of the court, and sent to another place: and his highness rode in his progress with Mistress Ann Boleyn in his company all the green season."—Cavend. p. 171.

CHAPTER III.

THE INHIBITORY BRIEF—HENRY TAMPERS WITH THE UNIVERSITIES—HENRY'S COMPLAINT—REPLY OF CLEMENT TO THE REMONSTRANCE—RISE OF THOMAS CROMWELL—THE CLERGY THREATENED WITH A PRÆMUNIRE—THEIR QUALIFIED CONCESSION REGARDING THE KING'S SUPREMACY—PROTEST AND DEATH OF WARHAM—FIRST-FRUITS PROHIBITED—MORE'S DEFENCE OF THE CLERGY—SURRENDER INTO THE KING'S HANDS OF THE RIGHT OF MAKING ECCLESIASTICAL REGULATIONS.

ALTHOUGH beginning now to despair of success, Henry once more despatched his messengers to Rome (Jan. 1530); but he threatened, that if he failed, he would set up in the Pope's place a bishop with patriarchal authority. The father of Anne Boleyn, who had been lately created earl of Wiltshire, was the chief of the royal envoys; and Thomas Cranmer, a chaplain in his family, and afterwards the too celebrated archbishop of Canterbury, was amongst the divines attached to the embassy. Clement, but a few days before their arrival, had drawn up an inhibitory brief, forbidding Henry's marriage with Anne Boleyn, or any other person, until the lawfulness of such a marriage was duly announced. On the arrival of the envoys, he for a short time withheld his signature. Nothing, however, followed from their efforts.

Baffled in their attempts, the ambassadors eagerly, on their way home, promoted another of Henry's schemes. This was to obtain favourable opinions from the various universities. This, if successful, might, they thought, either warp the Pontiff's judgment, or throw an air of plausibility upon Henry's cause. Money, promises, all the arts of which Henry and his agents were capable, were lavishly employed. It was, however, scarcely worth so much trouble. It was the

Pope's place to decide, and little could he be influenced, knowing, as he did, in what way Henry's agents were proceeding. All the replies, moreover, which favoured the king (many, after all, were against him), were given on the supposition that Catherine's marriage with Arthur was consummated: the very point on which Henry had been reduced to silence by his high-spirited, but not the less obedient queen. The king might well have spared himself the trouble to collect opinions.*

These opinions, however, Henry sent to Rome, taking care that they should be accompanied by a letter of remonstrance from the parliament. This letter spoke of the "justice" of Henry's cause; of the "pain" and "injury" which they, the members of the state, suffered in common with its head; and intimated that if his Holiness refused or deferred to heal them, they were yet not altogether without a remedy, although an extreme one (dated July 13th, 1530). These undutiful hints and assertions were signed, with shame be it said, by two archbishops, four bishops, and twenty-two abbots, besides forty-four peers, and eleven members of the House of Commons. It was not the first time, that such an address, nominally from the nation, but in reality from a perverse ruler, had insulted the Holy See. As if to add to the effect of these documents, Henry himself wrote, at the same time, a letter of bitter complaint to the Pope, charging him with being either unjust in granting the late commission, or wrong and deceitful in revoking it (Aug. 1530).

The poor Pope, in his reply to the parliament, seemed to plead guilty to the former horn of the king's dilemma; he had allowed himself to be led by his partiality for Henry "more than by the rigour of law" (Sept. 27). He explained the causes of the

* Le Grand, iii. No. 47, pp. 399 and 454. See the opinions of the Univers. at full length in Hall, Le Grand, or Dodd. See the inhibitory brief amongst Dodd's Records, Church Hist. i. p. 379, fol. ed.; or Le Grand.

delay, and, referring to their threat of "seeking a remedy elsewhere," admonished them to refrain from a scheme unworthy both of their prudence and their religion: if a sick man chose, in his impatience, his own remedies, and so increased his sickness, it was no fault of his physician. For his own part, he would do whatever was consistent with justice and the honour of the Holy See to bring the matter to as speedy a termination as possible, and thus to free the king and the queen, and himself likewise, from a most unpleasant business.*

What was now to be done? Humility would whisper submit, and await in patience the Pope's decision; but pride would become more obstinate, and Henry was the slave of pride no less than of lust. Faith, however, was still strong in his heart, and even worldly honour, as well as pride itself in some degree, took part with faith. A fearful struggle raged within his breast: he became moody and abstracted. The watchful eyes of the Boleyns saw the change: they were trembling for their long cherished hopes, when they found an unexpected auxiliary in Thomas Cromwell.

This man, once a trooper in the Italian wars, then a clerk in a Venetian counting-house, and at last a lawyer, had been Wolsey's agent in suppressing some small and half-deserted religious houses, for the endowment of the college of poor scholars at Ipswich. On the disgrace of the cardinal, Cromwell found means to be returned as a burgess to parliament, left his former patron, and went to court to seek his fortune, or, as he himself expressed it, "to make or mar." In this expression he embodied the absorbing thought of his soul. The manner of doing this never troubled him. To discover the inclinations of princes, and to gratify them while glossing them over externally with specious appearances, was his

* See Tiern.'s Dodd, App. Nos. 25 and 26; Herbert, p. 331, &c. Herbert assigns Jan. 25, 1532, as the date of Henry's letter.

avowed method of securing for himself both favour and authority.

He had not long forsaken the cardinal, when he perceived the king's perplexity. He found an opportunity of addressing him. To speak of submission would scarcely please; he spoke, therefore, of revolt. He pointed to Germany, and asked why the mighty Henry alone should remain in tutelage?

The king listened to his tempter, and the time of grace passed away: yes, he would teach the Pope what it was to trifle with his wishes. The suggestion, indeed, was scarcely new. The threat had already been employed by the royal agents at Rome; but at that time it had scarcely a meaning. Now it suddenly grew into a settled purpose: "Let us break their bonds asunder; and let us cast away their yoke from us."

The king's gloom disappeared, and, directed by his new adviser, his measures against the Holy See were soon in full development. To extort the consent of the clergy, or at least to beat down their opposition, they were themselves attacked: they were charged with having violated the statutes of præmunire, by allowing Wolsey to exercise the legatine powers which he had received from Rome.

Henry was well aware (so the cardinal stated to the king's judges) that Wolsey had received his own license for this exercise of power, and, consequently, that the law had not been violated; but he was equally well aware that, to please his royal caprice, and win back his favour, the cardinal had not produced the license. With equal disregard to truth, honour, and justice, the tyrant unblushingly produced his accusation in the Court of King's Bench.*

The clergy were taken completely by surprise. They had already, at the king's command, been petitioned against by the commons for harshness in levying fines and other alleged grievances; but the present

* Pole's Apol. ad Cæs. pp. 126, 134; Cavend. pp. 194, 207, &c.; Hall, pp. 194 and 195 (22nd of Henry VIII.).

blow was directly from the hand of the king. They assembled in convocation; but instead of standing manfully on their defence, and gloriously suffering the consequences of a law passed in hostility to the Church, they proffered, as an indemnity, or, as they called it, a voluntary subsidy, the enormous sum of one hundred thousand pounds, to be paid in five annual instalments (Nov. 5, 1529,* to Jan. 24, 1531).

Henry's ministers replied that the king expected something more; that they must insert in their grant a declaration that "he alone was the Protector and Supreme Head of the Church and clergy of England;"† and that it was by his protection that they were enabled to undertake that "care of souls which had been intrusted to his majesty." Until all this was satisfactorily terminated, they were not to expect that a clause regarding the king's pardon, which the king's ministers had produced amongst the rest, would be confirmed.

The surprise of the convocation redoubled. It talked, debated, adjourned, again assembled, changed the place of meeting to the chapter-house of Westminster, much against the will of the abbot; devised expedients, and held conferences with the king's commissioners, amongst whom Cromwell, now a member of the Privy Council, made his ominous appearance. It began, at last, to consider that it was safe, if it consented in a modified sense by adding to the words, "Sole Supreme Head," the expression, "as far as the Law of Christ allows." In short, it was but too evidently paralyzed with fear. Some who ought to have advised and sustained the rest, had been Henry's agents at Rome. To please him, they had for many months exercised themselves in habits of disrespect to the Holy See. No wonder they had little zeal remaining. They had all, indeed, but one path before them: to reject without compromise a declaration

* According to the document in Wilkins (pp. 717—742).

† This title Parker attributes to the combined advice of both Cromwell and Cranmer.—De Antiquitate Brit. p. 325.

contrary to all the monuments and traditions of their Church; contrary, in short, to the faith. This, indeed, in the convocation of York, Tunstall, the new bishop of Durham, strongly proposed. Indebted to Henry for his presentation to the bishopric,* he nevertheless spoke fearlessly in defence of the Church. If, he said, the meaning of the expression is, that the king is head in temporals only, as is the truth, "and as we all acknowledge," let it be clearly stated, in order that heretics may not distort it to their own sense: if the meaning is, as the words appear to signify, that the king is supreme head both in spirituals and in temporals, and that, as some malignant men seem to hold, it is affirmed that this meaning is according to the law of Christ, then do I expressly dissent from this expression, "lest I should seem to dissent from the Catholic Church, out of which there is no salvation for a Christian." To prevent such ambiguity, and to prevent scandal to little ones, I propose that we acknowledge him sole supreme head after Christ in temporals, subjecting in all things my protest and declaration to the judgment of Holy Mother the Church. Instead of being aroused by this noble example, the convocation agreed to the proposed modification. To the words "Supreme Head," therefore, it added the clause, "as far as the law of Christ will allow;" and the expression, "that care of souls which has been intrusted to his majesty," was now so inserted in a eulogium of Henry's work against Luther, as to appear as a mere fact that they had thus been defended in their "care of the souls of the *people* who had been intrusted to his majesty." †

* The Pope, by a provision, translated him from the see of London to that of Durham at Henry's request, March 1st, 1529.—Rymer, vol. vi.

† Cavend. pp. 209, 210, &c.; Wilk. iii. pp. 725, 742, and 745; Hall, 184, 188, &c. Hall's account of the new title is brief and pointed; and even in its misstatement is characteristic of the *protégé* of the government of Edward VI.:—"In this submission, the clergy called the king Supreme Head of the Church of England, which thing they never confessed before" (p. 195, 22nd of Henry).

The convocation, when, at last, exhibiting signs of assenting, was probably stimulated by an act of indemnity passed (Jan. 16) on condition of the subsidy being voted, and, in the words of the act, through "his highness having always a tender eye, with mercy and pity and compassion, towards his said spiritual subjects." In the instrument granting the required sum the clauses would have to be incorporated, and thus it would seem that they were, after so long a struggle, finally hurried through: the clergy consented to everything eight days after the act of indemnity; and the despatch of Warham describing the history and conclusion of the convocation is dated March 22, 1530, or in the present style, 1531.

Whether Henry were irresolute, or whether he foresaw how easily he could introduce the modified or obliterated clauses in a future parliament, he said that he was now satisfied; and being equally pleased with the convocation of York, he granted them both a deed of pardon. Good reason had he to be satisfied: he had not only thus far obtained the new title, but had procured from the convocations of York and Canterbury, as well as from the House of Commons, a remission of all debts contracted not only with the various members, but with any of the clergy or laity! *

Warham of Canterbury, who ought to have guided the late convocation, and been its animating spirit, was now beginning to feel the approaches of his last illness. Being in many respects a good, as well as a learned prelate, he mourned over the impending ruin of the Church in England, foretelling that Thomas Cranmer would be his successor, and would inflict greater injury than the blood of St. Thomas the martyr had purchased good. Thus grieving and dying, and, it is to be hoped, repenting of his own feebleness of opposition, Warham, in an upper room in his palace at Lambeth, wrote, in presence of three

* Stat. 21, Act 26, ap. Burn.; Hall; Wilk. iii. pp. 744 and 746; Harpsf. p. 633.

witnesses, a protestation, to be immediately made public, in which he declared, that he did not, and could not in conscience, assent to the recent enactments, "inasmuch as statutes of this kind tend to the subversion of ecclesiastical power, and are evidently derogatory to the rights of the Apostolic See, and of the church of Canterbury."

His death was soon followed by decided measures against the Holy See, and by a second blow at the rights of the clergy.

After the failure of the earl of Wiltshire's embassy, Henry still maintained some communication with Rome, but its very nature indicated a crisis* (Oct. 1530).

As Catherine had made her appeal and persisted in it, the Pope cut off all applications for new commissions and other schemes by an "Inhibitory Bull," forbidding, under the usual censures, all persons and courts, except those that were authorized at Rome, to interfere in any way in the decision of the question; and, at the same time, forbidding the king, in an equally solemn manner, to abandon his queen, or to marry again, until the Holy See had pronounced its decision† (Jan. 1531).

Such a course was that of both law and justice; but it was the reverse of what Henry desired, and therefore, after some further negotiations, it was followed by a royal prohibition to pay the annats or first-fruits of benefices. These first-fruits had for several ages been regularly transmitted by the clergy of nearly all Christendom to the Holy See. They annually amounted in England to between three and four thousand pounds. They were now prohibited by act of parliament, unless the king should grant a license for their payment, or enter into a composition with Rome.‡

* For the application for a new court of commission, and for the insulting demeanour of Henry's agents, &c., see Dr. Bennet's despatch in Tierney's Dodd, i. App. No. 28. Wilk. ut supra.

† Ib. No. 29.

‡ Stat. 23 Hen. VIII. c. 20. The total sum collected from the

Whilst this schismatical confiscation was as yet under discussion, a measure against the enactment of ecclesiastical laws was in course of rapid preparation.

As if preparatory to it, a work had been already published and presented to Henry, called the "Supplication of Beggars," purporting to be the petition of the poor; depicting, in a heavy, laboured style, their sufferings, and declaring that certain robust beggars were the cause of their misfortunes. The latter, it asserted, were no other than the clergy and monks, whose reputations it strove to blacken by the most infamous accusations. Its assertions so excited the indignation of Chancellor More, that, although he knew well the source of this and many other libellous imputations was in the royal court itself, he hesitated not to refute the calumnies, and thus expose the real character of the work, as well as prove the utility, both in temporals and spirituals, of those who were so cruelly assailed.*

The chancellor's reply may have saved for a time the property of the Church, but it could not avert another still more dangerous attack. An address was got up in the Commons, complaining that the Convocation sometimes made enactments in matters purely temporal, and enforced them by spiritual censures.

Henry sent the address (which, of course, he himself and Cromwell had devised) to the Convocation; and required a promise that they would never more enact, publish, or enforce any constitutions whatever without the king's assent.

Although such constitutions had been passed in synod for nine hundred years, the name of convocation and the forms of that meeting could date back

second of Henry VII., a period of forty-five years, was said to be one hundred and sixty thousand pounds.

* Sand. pp. 68 and 69, &c. Something of the kind seems to be meant in a previous letter of the bishop of Bayonne:—"La fantaisie de ces seigneurs est que lui [Wolsey] mort ou ruiné, ils déféront incontinent ici l'estat de l'église et prendront tous leurs biens," &c. (Oct. 17, 1529).—Among the original letters in Cavendish, vol. ii. letter xix.

but little more than three hundred years. It arose from the pecuniary wants both of the Crown and the Holy See. Those abbots and priors who were not barons were summoned to parliament for the first time by King John, who induced them to grant him a supply, and then, by writing to the various archdeaconries, induced the clergy to imitate their example. When Innocent IV., however, had applied for aid, he caused the clergy to meet by their representatives in what became afterwards known as the Convocation. Successive kings saw the advantage of the form of convocation, and therefore made use of it ever after for levying taxes upon the clergy.

This meeting was sometimes useful to the clergy themselves for their own more immediate business. The old assemblies, however, of rural deaneries, and especially of diocesan and provincial synods, were still held as before, and were still the means by which the laws and general action of the Church teaching were brought to bear upon the whole flock.

These means were now to be wrested from the English Church. Even considered as mere human means, they had been sanctioned by law, and become incorporated in the very marrow of the constitution of the country. They had acted as a check upon every kind of arbitrary power: they thwarted parish priest or bishop when forgetful of others' just rights; they kept the layman, too, in his place, even were he a crowned head; nor, as long as the country remained Catholic, could a servile parliament, or even a servile episcopacy, destroy them. While their sheltering branches and foliage waved majestically amongst the accompanying growth of English customs and laws, their roots were twined around the base, not of an English throne, but of the everlasting Chair of St. Peter.

Only by violent separation could they be hewed away: only by an act of schism. All their efficacy was from the confirmation which they had received from Rome; that confirmation was never more to be

asked. In place of it the king's sanction was to be enough. Such was Henry's will. Nay more, all existing ecclesiastical regulations were to be examined by a board of commissioners appointed by the king, of whom sixteen were to be laymen and sixteen clergymen.

Did the Convocation now, at least, see the tendency of Henry's proposals? Did they take heart enough for an encounter to the death? Alas! they again talked and protested; but firm resistance there was scarcely any. They one and all said, indeed, that in faith and morals they alone had the right, and from Christ himself, to make laws. Yet, as if they could transfer what they acknowledged that Christ had given to none but themselves, they surrendered, as far as their cowardice could, all that Henry asked.

True it is they remonstrated; then stated their readiness to give it for Henry's life; and sent to the king a written answer to the address of the House of Commons. True it is that even Gardiner, now bishop of Winchester, a king's creature as he was, could not refrain from an expostulation, which drew upon him the frowns of the court and the king's rebuke; but, cowed as they were, they gladly yielded, in consideration, they meanly said, of the high wisdom and goodness of the king. Oh! "Tell it not in Geth, publish it not in the streets of Ascalon: lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice, lest the daughters of the uncircumcised triumph" (May 15, 1532).*

* See Wilk. vol. iii. p. 749, &c.

CHAPTER IV.

ANNE BOLEYN'S NEW TITLE AND INCOME—HER MARRIAGE—ITS INVALIDITY—VARIOUS BISHOPRICS CONFERRED UPON THE KING'S ABETTORS—CRANMER, ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY—HIS SINGULAR PROTEST—PRONOUNCES SENTENCE OF DIVORCE—POPULAR INDIGNATION — THE NEW MARRIAGE OPENLY REBUKED BY BROTHERS PETO AND ELSTOW—PERSECUTION OF THEIR ORDER—HENRY AND ANNE COMMANDED BY THE HOLY SEE TO SEPARATE —FINAL DECISION REGARDING THE MARRIAGE OF HENRY AND CATHERINE—DEATH OF THE LATTER—JOY, DISGRACE, AND DEATH OF ANNE BOLEYN.

ANNE BOLEYN had now continued for many months to be Henry's inseparable companion. In a letter to her father, the new earl of Wiltshire, Cranmer was not ashamed to write as follows: "The king and my lady Anne rode yesterday to Windsor; and this night they be looked for again at Hampton Court. God be their guide." In the following September (A.D. 1532), she was made marchioness of Pembroke, with a pension of £1,000 per annum, not however from the king's revenues, but from those of the church of Durham. There appears to have been no resistance. Tunstall, the bishop of Durham, was learned and eloquent, and had shown some spirit in the question of the royal supremacy; but, good easy man, he had no ambition for the crown of martyrdom. Thus did one prelate after another, gradually but surely, concur in sacrificing the rights and liberties of the Church in England. The decisive step was, at last, taken by the celebration of a so-called marriage between the king and Anne. One of the royal chaplains, Rowland Lee, was suddenly called upon, early one wintry morning, to join them in wedlock, and to say the nuptial mass. The king silenced his objections, it is said, by assuring him that he had received a papal brief, permitting the

marriage. Such was this inauspicious wedding; begun in sin, and soon to end in blood (Jan. 25, 1533).*

The law of England, at that time, acknowledged no other rule in matrimonial causes, than the law of the Church; and this law, in doubtful cases, was no other than the Pope's decision. The Pope (Julius II.) had decided that Henry could lawfully marry Catherine; the Pope (Clement VII.) had again sanctioned that marriage, forbidding Henry to marry any other, and therefore by the laws of the Church, and as a logical sequence by the laws of the land, Henry's marriage ceremony with Anne Boleyn was no real marriage in the sight of God or man. He himself, and all engaged, were, by the very fact, subjected not only to the strongest disapprobation, but to the excommunication of holy Church.

Regardless, however, of anything but the present gratification of his own will, Henry rewarded his obsequious agents with a munificence that would have been truly royal, had it been at his own cost. Rowland Lee, who had just married him, was soon bishop of Chester, and afterwards of Lichfield and Coventry, holding, at the same time, the presidentship of Wales (April, 1534). Another Lee (Edward), who had been employed at Rome, conjoint ambassador with Dr. Stockley, the bishop elect of London, and the earl of Wiltshire, had already been made archbishop of York (A.D. 1531). Tunstall, the keeper of the rolls and privy-seal, had been transferred, in 1530, from London to the almost kingly see of Durham. Gardiner, as we have seen, was rewarded, in 1531, with the rich and important see of Winchester. Another bishopric, the most important of all, that of Canterbury, was now vacant by the death of Warham, and no other than

* Strype's Cranm. App. No. 1 (Cranmer to earl of Wiltshire). In this letter Cranmer states that people now begin to hate the priests, but cannot be persuaded to hate the "matrimony" with Catherine. Sanders, p. 61; Le Grand, i. pp. 233—237, &c.; iii. No. 65; and ii. p. 110. See also Cranmer's letter in Archæol. xviii. p. 81. Stowe, p. 559.

Thomas Cranmer was selected by Henry to be the next archbishop. Cranmer had shown his too ready zeal for the king in the embassy of the earl of Wiltshire, in writing a pamphlet in favour of the divorce, and by his activity in eliciting the opinions of the universities. It would, indeed, have checked his promotion, had it been generally known that he was inoculated with Calvinism, and had married for the second time; but these facts he carefully concealed.*

In all the consecrations which had even lately taken place, the bulls had been procured as usual. This was done by Cranmer likewise. It was equally usual to take an oath of fidelity to the Holy See. Now, fidelity was the very thing which Cranmer was determined not to keep. Did he then, as became an honourable man, refuse both the oath and the office? Not at all: he accepted the office, and took the oath. The manner in which he tried to save his conscience, or rather his credit, is characteristic. Before the consecration, at which he was publicly to take this oath (March 30, 1533), he called four persons into the chapter-house of St. Stephen's College, and told them that what he was going to swear he intended as a mere form, and as no obstacle to any reformation which he might think proper to make in the Church of England.† He is said to have repeated this protest at the time of his consecration; but if so, it was as private as before, so private as to attract no notice on the part of a numerous assemblage.

The pallium, the badge of jurisdiction, being brought from Rome, he not only received it, thus acknowledging that his power to act as bishop was derived from Rome, but took once more the usual oath of canonical obedience to the Holy See. That oath had but one meaning in the natural sense of its words; but one meaning on the part of the Holy See, by whom it was administered; but one meaning in

* Stowe, p. 543, &c.; Herbert; Godwin, de Præs.

† See his protestation in Tierney's Dodd, vol. i. App. No. 32; or Strype's Cranm. b. i. c. 4, and App. v. &c.

canon law; but one meaning in the practice, for many previous centuries, of Cranmer's predecessors. Yet all this was to be as nothing, was to cease to be the meaning, was to become an empty form, by the private protest of Cranmer! The oath was, however, publicly taken. Cranmer's private reservation could not alter such a compact, could not make a solemn invocation of God's justice be other than, in the face of the Church, it was —an oath; and its violation, not mere duplicity, but perjury.

One of the first public acts of Cranmer, after his consecration, was an open violation of his oath of obedience to the Holy See. Clement VII. had issued an inhibitory brief, prohibiting any person or court to pronounce a decision regarding the marriage of Henry and Catherine. In utter contempt of this prohibition, Cranmer prepared, forthwith, to pronounce a decision. Having received the royal "license to proceed to the examination and final determination of the said cause," he proceeded to Dunstable, and sent Dr. Lee to Ampthill (about three miles off), to command Catherine to appear before him, and "hear the final sentence." The poor queen gave, as her answer once for all, that she had laid her cause before the Pope, and would submit to no other tribunal. Catherine's firmness being well known, this answer was previously calculated upon: any other would have perplexed the new archbishop. He declared her contumacious; and pronounced her marriage with Henry null, alleging as his reason, that the Pope, in such a case, was unable to grant a dispensation. Cranmer then issued a sentence of divorce (May 23rd, 1533); and so courageous had he suddenly grown, that he did not forget to menace the king with excommunication, unless he abandoned his brother's widow.*

Loud was the clamour that immediately arose. The people, on all sides, gave utterance to their amazement

* See documents in Coll. vol. ii.; Records, No. 23; and Wilk. v. iii. p. 759; Rym. xiv. 467; and Cranmer's letter to Hawkins, in the Archæol. xviii. p. 79.

and indignation. The women were particularly forward. Nor could the tumult be suppressed, until Anne Boleyn's own sister-in-law, and the sister-in-law of the duke of Norfolk, were shut up in the Tower.

The pulpit had already broken, for a moment, its ignominious silence, and thundered an unpalatable truth even into the ears of Henry himself. Peto, a Franciscan observant, having to preach before the king and his court in the church at Greenwich, cautioned Henry to beware of Achab's four hundred false prophets, and of Achab's punishment. On the following Sunday, a more courtly preacher was found. This was Dr. Curwin, who was not content with contradicting Peto, but styled him "a dog, slanderer, and traitor," for presuming "to speak so audaciously to princes." As soon as Curwin finished, Elstow, another friar, arose to confirm what Peto had said, charging Curwin with being one of the four hundred false prophets who were leading the king to perdition, and who were seeking by adultery to establish succession. Such boldness, it was thought, would quail beneath the rebuke of the Privy Council. The two friars were, therefore, summoned to its presence; and amongst other gracious terms, were assured that they deserved to be sewn up in sacks, and thrown into the Thames. The experiment was a failure; the rebukers were themselves rebuked and silenced. "With thanks to God," said the undaunted and quick-witted friars, "we know the way to heaven to be as ready by water as by land; and, therefore, we care not which way we go." The whole body of their brethren proved to be animated by the same spirit. They were, therefore, ejected from their various houses; and many were cast into prison. When fifty had there perished with want, the rest were released and banished.

The presumptuous act of Cranmer, which had elicited so strong a feeling in England, could not be overlooked in Rome. It was annulled; and Henry and his pretended queen, Anne, were excommunicated, unless before the end of September they either sepa-

rated or showed cause for being considered man and wife. Henry paid little regard to the Pope's injunction, but still, for a time, at the request of his ally, Francis I., he continued some feeble negotiations with the Holy See. His agents, however, showed more strongly than ever the schismatical spirit that possessed their master, by at last appealing in his name from the Pope to a general council. Clement's patience, however, was not yet exhausted; he still believed that time would remove the king's infatuation. He, therefore, still delayed; but, pressed both by Francis, and still more urgently by Charles, he referred the question to the cardinals. Out of two-and-twenty who assembled for this purpose, three voted for further delay, and the rest unanimously declared that the marriage with Catherine was valid. The Pope could no longer refuse judgment.

In the solemn document drawn up on this occasion, he referred to Catherine's appeal, and to the investigations that followed, and in presence of the consistory of cardinals declared, by a "definitive sentence," that the marriage between Catherine and Henry was valid and canonical in itself and in all its consequences; that Henry was, and is, and would be bound to live with Catherine; that he was to refrain from ever again speaking upon the subject; and was to bear all the expenses of Catherine's appeal (March 23, 1534).*

Less than two years after this decision the injured Catherine expired at Kimbolton, in Huntingdonshire (Jan. 8, 1536).

Her last message to Henry, assuring him of her forgiveness, and entreating him to provide for his

* See documents in Tierney's Dodd, v. i. No. 34; Hall; 25th Hen. VIII. &c.; and Le Grand, iii. pp. 569 and 636; and comp. Sand, Herbert, and Stowe, an. 1533, pp. 543—561; Strype's Memor. i. p. 168. Clement's bulls vary in their commencement of the year. In 1529 he determined that in briefs the year should begin Dec. 25, and in bulls March 25.—(Fœdera, xiv. 294, 355.) If this rule were adhered to, the bull in the text would be March 23, 1535. But Clement died in Sept. 1534; and various letters in Le Grand equally show that the bull was really issued in 1534.

soul, agitated the ruthless king even to tears. Very different were the feelings of Anne Boleyn. Such was her joy at the news, that she was unable to assume even a decent exterior: Henry commanded his attendants to put on mourning, but Anne put on yellow silk, exclaiming that now she was indeed a queen. Little time had she to rejoice: in four months she was put on her trial for being unfaithful to Henry, was divorced by Cranmer, and was speedily led to the block. Her memory was branded with the foul charges of adultery and incest; her pretended marriage with the king was declared by act of parliament null from the beginning, through certain impediments which she was said to have at last acknowledged to Cranmer; and her child Elizabeth was declared by the same authority illegitimate. Henry on the day of her execution decked himself in white, and on the following morning married the Lady Jane Seymour, who had been one of her maids of honour (May 20, 1536).*

* Pol. Verg., Stowe, Herb., Camden's Eliz. Apparatus, Sir John Hayward's Edw. VI. Hayward and Camden were Protestants, and were born a little after the middle of this century. Hayward's statement about Edward the Sixth's birth, as being snatched from his mother by the knife, agrees with that of Saunders, but is called in question by Strype, on the ground that the letters of the queen and her physicians state that she was "well delivered."

Fuller, although born somewhat later than Camden, has faithfully portrayed the cringing state of the Convocation ever since it yielded to the king on the question of supremacy. Speaking of the readiness with which it passed Anne Boleyn's divorce, he says:—"Yea, in this convocation nothing was propounded in the king's name but it passed presently. O, the operation of a purge of præmunire so lately taken by the clergy, and a hundred thousand pounds paid thereupon! How did the remembrance thereof still work on their spirits, and make them meek and mortified!"—(Ch. Hist. sec. iv. No. 26.) Fuller might, however, have added another reason: the repugnance of the great body of the clergy to the pretended divorce from Catherine. Fuller, although less refined, and more easily borne away by his love of a smart expression, is in many respects the very prototype of Gibbon: plausible, antithetical, sneering, and often, even in his faults, amusing.

CHAPTER V.

STATUTES AGAINST THE HOLY SEE, IN ITS CONFIRMATION OF SYNODAL REGULATIONS AND EPISCOPAL ELECTIONS; AND IN ITS RECEPTION OF APPEALS, AND ITS GRANT OF SPIRITUAL POWERS AND DISPENSATIONS—PARLIAMENTARY CONFIRMATION OF THE KING'S MARRIAGE WITH ANNE; AND ITS TRAIN OF NEW KINDS OF TREASON, OR MISPRISION OF TREASON—THE OATH OF OBEDIENCE TO THIS ACT—SIR THOMAS MORE'S RESIGNATION OF THE SEALS—SIR THOMAS AND FISHER OF ROCHESTER REFUSE THE NEW OATH, AND ARE COMMITTED TO THE TOWER—THE ACT AND OATH OF SUPREMACY—ATTEMPTS TO ENSNARE THE BISHOP AND EX-CHANCELLOR—THEIR CONDEMNATION—LAST MOMENTS OF FISHER—MORE'S COLLOQUY WITH HIS JUDGES IMMEDIATELY AFTER HIS CONDEMNATION—HIS EXECUTION—GENERAL FEELING OF THE CLERGY REGARDING THE KING'S SUPREMACY—THE KING'S URGENT CHARGES TO HIS JUSTICES TO REPRESS IT.

Some time before these tragical events, and, indeed, whilst the Pope and cardinals were as yet deliberating upon the final decision regarding Catherine's marriage, the English parliament, passively obedient to the royal will, was enacting a rapid succession of statutes rebellious and hostile in the widest sense to the authority of the Holy See (Jan. 15, 1534). Various statutes having been made against heresy, it was declared, that if any one spoke or did anything against the authority of the Pope, he should no longer be considered a heretic. Then, as if to act at once in accordance with this decree, the Pope's right to confirm ecclesiastical constitutions was ignored, the clergy being, in accordance with their own recent concession, forbidden to make synodal laws without the royal license. As the action of the Holy See upon the Church in England was thus directly set aside, it was deemed advisable to allege some reason for so marked a change; and as it was impossible to deny the fact of synodal regulations having had no force without

the Pope's sanction, the parliament, without citing one single proof or instance, coolly and roundly asserted that that sanction was merely on sufferance. "Because," said the statute, "recognizing no superior under God but only your grace," your realm has never admitted, except on sufferance, "the laws of any foreign prince, potentate, or prelate;" and can therefore abolish what it has only tolerated. With regard to the ecclesiastical constitutions already made, they were to be examined by a board of thirty-two persons, by whose decision they were either to be annulled or to remain in force. As, however, they were to remain until positively rejected, and as the examination made little progress, the greater part of the ecclesiastical laws of the Anglican Establishment are no other, even at the present day, than the old canon law of the Catholic Church in England.

In the same parliament, a recent act, forbidding appeals to Rome, and intended to hamper poor Catherine, was extended to all applications for licenses, dispensations, faculties, or other instruments. Payments of every kind to the Holy See were prohibited: "Forasmuch as your majesty is supreme head of the Church of England, as the prelates and clergy" (so said the statute) "have recognized." *

Another recent act, forbidding the payment of first-fruits, the operation of which had hitherto been left to the royal discretion, was now made absolute law. As another blow against the Pope's authority, bishops, on the one hand, were to be elected by the chapters with the royal license, or, if the chapter neglected, by the king; and, on the other, were to be confirmed, not as hitherto by the Holy See, but by the archbishop of Canterbury, at the king's suggestion. Priors, deans, and others, either neglecting to proceed to such election and consecration, or admitting, obeying, or executing censures and prohibitions, were doomed to all

* This act might be annulled by Henry, provided it were done before a certain fixed time,—the Nativity of St. John the Baptist. The king still thought that money could influence the Holy See.

the penalties of a præmunire. Appeals from the archbishop of Canterbury were no longer to be carried to Rome, but were to be made henceforth to the king, in his Court of Chancery. By the last of these numerous acts, the marriage with Catherine was declared null and void; and that with Anne Boleyn (although made before even Cranmer's sentence of divorce) was to be reputed lawful and valid. To do so much as to speak against this marriage, was made misprision of treason, and to be punished with forfeiture, and with imprisonment at the royal discretion. To attack it in any other way, was nothing less than high treason. Nor could people screen themselves from the effect of this statute by a careful silence: every one who had become of age was to swear obedience "to the whole effects and contents of this present act," or to suffer the penalties of misprision of treason.* This was the beginning of a series of similar oaths (the disgrace of the English legislature), by which multitudes were to be forced either to perjure themselves, or to incur severe punishment, not for external acts, but for conscientious belief or opinions.

The new oath was proffered to the members of parliament, and speedily to all classes; and many were those that suffered the penalties of a refusal. Amongst them were two of the most illustrious individuals in the country, not only for rank, but for learning and virtue. These were Fisher, the bishop of Rochester, and Sir Thomas More. The former was a tried friend of Henry VII., and the preceptor of Henry VIII. himself; the latter had succeeded Wolsey as chancellor, and in that capacity had laid before the parliament the documents obtained from the universities regarding the marriage with Catherine. Fearing, however, to be urged to something directly against his conscience, he requested his intimate friend, the duke of Norfolk, to obtain for him leave to resign his seals. During the negotiation, the duke happened to

* Stat. 25 Hen. VIII. c. 14, and 19—22, and accompanying notes. See also Sand.

pay More a visit, at Chelsea. He found him singing in the choir of the church, and wearing a surplice. "A parish clerk, a parish clerk!" said the worldly-minded duke, as they went out after service; "you dishonour the king and his office." "Nay," said the chancellor smiling, "not for serving God, his master." The duke succeeded at last in obtaining Henry's acquiescence, and More gladly ceased to be chancellor.

Keen-sighted in politics, More, when he found that Cranmer had pronounced the sentence of divorce, exclaimed to Roper, his son-in-law and biographer, "God give grace, son, that these matters, within a while, be not confirmed with oaths." His fears were soon realized.

The first cause of complaint against himself and Rochester was their conversation with a certain nun at Canterbury. This nun fancied that she had revelations regarding the king's wicked life, as well as his marriage with Anne, and his new supremacy. To obtain the advice of so able a director, she consulted the bishop of Rochester. He said, in reply, that there was nothing in her supposed visions contrary to the laws of God and His Church; and advised her to speak to the king himself. She did so. Soon after a bill of attainder was introduced against the poor nun and some other persons, as guilty of high treason; and against Fisher and More, for misprision of treason. Rochester was included in the bill, and lost a considerable part of his property. More escaped this danger, but soon fell, together with the bishop, into another still greater.

When the oath of succession was administered at Lambeth to the clergy of London, Sir Thomas was included in the summons, being the only layman thus honoured. On receiving it, he immediately, according to his custom on all emergencies, went to pray in the church, and to prepare himself for holy communion. He then presented himself at Lambeth: there the oath was tendered, but in an altered form. Henry had inserted in it a clause asserting that no power on

earth could dispense with the much-talked-of prohibition in Leviticus, and caused it, in this form, to be administered to the bishop and ex-chancellor. They refused it, and were committed to the Tower.

By a new device of Cromwell's invention, the old forms of trial, whether by judge or jury, were now, whenever the Crown wished for a conviction, supplanted by what was called a bill of attainder; that is, a declaration of the parliament, in utter contempt of justice, that prisoners whom it had never tried were guilty, as the case might be, of either treason or misprision of treason.

By such a process, Fisher and More were doomed to forfeiture and perpetual imprisonment. Even this, however, although it was the second blow dealt against the bishop, was not enough for Henry and his advisers. Two men of such independent spirit, and so evidently averse to the new marriage, suited neither Henry nor the Boleyns. The means for making away with them, right or wrong, must be found, and in such a reign could not long be wanting.*

Whilst they were lying in prison, an act was passed "by authority of this present parliament, that the king our sovereign lord, his heirs and successors, kings of his realm, shall be taken, accepted, and reputed the only Supreme Head on earth of the Church of England."

Attached to this act was an oath, framed expressly for the bishops, by which they were to abjure, in the most unqualified manner, the Pope's supremacy. The oath of succession, or "matrimony," too, as lately altered by the king, was confirmed; being the very form, if we are to believe the supple parliament, which it had itself intended. The first-fruits of bene-

* Roper's More, pp. 29, 32, 38, 41, &c. Hearne's ed. Roper says that the oath which Sir Thomas was called upon to take was the oath of "supremacy and matrimony," by what would, at first sight, seem an inaccuracy; yet he is correct, the statement of the supremacy in the oath being explicit. See its forms in Rymer, tom. vi. part 2, pp. 192, 193, &c.

fices, and the tenths of the incomes of all livings, were now not only withheld from Rome, but were transferred to the king. The guilt and punishment of treason were extended to every declaration, whether in word or writing, that the king was a heretic, schismatic, tyrant, or infidel (Nov. and Dec. 1534). Such were the statutes of this parliament, and thus did tyranny and schism go hand in hand.

The two prisoners in the Tower were now, it was thought, in the toils of their pursuers. Could they be made to declare Henry a schismatic, their doom was sealed, and sealed with some appearance of at least legal justice. They were therefore questioned and examined, again and again. It is not unlikely that the oath of supremacy intended for bishops, was offered to Fisher and declined; certain it is that the accusation on which he was condemned was his denial of the supremacy. Sir Thomas, meantime, baffled all the arts of his enemies. He was, nevertheless, condemned; and his very silence, when questioned upon the king's supremacy, was alleged by the time-serving judges as a proof that he was guilty (June and July, 1535).*

The last words and acts of heroic men ought never to be forgotten; and, fortunately, there are still left some interesting details of the deaths both of Fisher and More.

Fisher was the first to suffer. A contemporary has left us the following narrative of his last moments:—

"After the lieutenant of the Tower had received the writ for his execution, in the morning before five of the clock, he came to him in his chamber, in the bell-tower; finding him yet asleep in his bed, and waking him, told him he was come to him on a message from the king, to signify unto him that his pleasure was he should suffer death that forenoon. 'Well,' quoth the bishop, 'if this be your errand, you bring me no great news; for I have looked a long time for this message, and I must humbly thank his majesty, that it pleaseth

* State Papers, tom. i. part 2, Nos. 31 and 32.

him to rid me from all this worldly business. Yet, let me by your patience sleep an hour or two, for I have slept very ill this night, not for any fear of death, I thank God, but by reason of my great infirmity and weakness.'

"'The king's pleasure is farther,' said the lieutenant, 'that you shall use as little speech as may be, especially of anything touching his majesty, whereby the people should have any cause to think of him, or his proceedings, otherwise than well.' 'For that,' said he, 'you shall see me order myself, as, by God's grace, neither the king, nor any man else, shall have occasion to mislike of my words.' With which answer the lieutenant departed from him; and so the prisoner, falling again to rest, slept soundly two hours and more; and, after he was awaked, called to his man to help him up; but first commanded him to take away his shirt of hair, which customably he wore, and to convey it privily out of the house; and, instead thereof, to lay him forth a clean white shirt, and all the best apparel he had, as cleanly brushed as might be. And as he was arraying himself, his man, seeing in him more curiosity and care for the fine and cleanly wearing of his apparel that day than was wont, demanded of him what this sudden change meant, saying, that his lordship knew well enough that he must put off all again within two hours, and lose it. 'What of that?' said he: 'dost not thou mark that this is our marriage-day? and that it behoveth us, therefore, to use more cleanliness for solemnity thereof?' About nine of the clock the lieutenant came again, and, finding him almost ready, said, he was now come for him. 'Then,' said he to his man, 'reach me my furred tippet to put about my neck.' 'O, my lord!' said the lieutenant, 'what need ye be so careful for your health for this time, being, as yourself knows, not much above an hour?' 'I think no otherwise,' said he, 'but yet, in the mean time, I will keep myself as well as I can. For I tell you truth; though I have, I thank our Lord, a very good desire

and willing mind to die at this present, and so trust of His infinite mercy and goodness He will continue it, yet will I not willingly hinder my health in the mean time one minute of an hour, but still prolong the same, as long as I can, by such reasonable ways and means as Almighty God hath provided for me.' And, with that, taking a little book in his hand, which was a New Testament lying by him, he made a cross on his forehead, and went out of his prison-door with the lieutenant, being so weak as that he was scant able to go down the stairs; wherefore, at the stairs' foot he was taken up in a chair between two of the lieutenant's men, and carried to the Tower-gate, with a great number of weapons about him, to be delivered to the sheriff of London for execution. And as they were come to the uttermost precinct of the liberties of the Tower, they rested there with him a space, till such time as one was sent before to know in what readiness the sheriffs were to receive him; during this space he rose out of his chair, and standing on his feet, leaned his shoulder to the wall, and lifting his eyes towards heaven, he opened a little book in his hand, and said, 'O Lord! this is the last time that ever I shall open this book; let some comfortable place now chance unto me, whereby I, Thy poor servant, may glorify Thee in this my last hour.' And, with that, looking into the book, the first thing that came to his sight were these words: 'Hæc est autem vita æterna, ut cognoscant te solum verum Deum, et quem misisti Jesum Christum. Ego te glorificavi super terram, opus consummavi quod dedisti mihi,' &c., John xvii. 3, &c.; and with that he shut the book together, and said, 'Here is even learning enough for me to my life's end.' And so, the sheriff being ready for him, he was taken up again among certain of the sheriff's men, with a new and much greater company of weapons than was before, and carried to the scaffold on the Tower-hill, otherwise called East Smithfield, himself praying all the way, and recording upon the words which he before had read. When he was come

to the foot of the scaffold, they that carried him offered to help him up the stairs; but, said he, 'Nay, masters, seeing I am come so far, let me alone, and ye shall see me shift for myself well enough!' and so went up the stairs without any help, so lively that it was a marvel to them that before knew his debility and weakness. But as he was mounting the stairs, the south-east sun shined very bright in his face: whereupon he said to himself these words, lifting up his hands: 'Accedite ad eum et illuminamini, et facies vestræ non confundentur.' By that time he was upon the scaffold it was about ten o'clock; where the executioner, being ready to do his office, kneeled down to him, as the fashion is, and asked him forgiveness. 'I forgie thee,' said he, 'with all my heart, and I trust thou shalt see me overcome this storm lustily.' Then was his gown and tippet taken from him, and he stood in his doublet and hose in sight of all the people, whereof there was no small number assembled to see the execution. Being upon the scaffold, he spake to the people in effect as followeth: 'Christian people, I come hither to die for the faith of Christ's holy Catholic Church; and, I thank God, hitherto my stomach hath served me very well thereunto, so that yet I have not feared death; wherefore I desire you all to help and assist with your prayers, that, at the very point and instant of death's stroke, I may in that very moment stand steadfast without fainting in any one point of the Catholic faith, free from any fear. And I beseech Almighty God of His infinite goodness to save the king and this realm, and that it may please Him to hold His holy hand over it, and send the king good counsel.' These words he spake with such a cheerful countenance, such a stout and constant courage, and such a reverend gravity, that he appeared to all men, not only void of fear, but also glad of death. After these few words by him uttered, he kneeled down on both his knees, and said certain prayers. Among which, as some reported, one was the hymn of 'Te Deum laudamus,' to the end; and the psalm, 'In te, Domine, speravi.' Then came the executioner, and

bound an handkerchief about his eyes; and so the bishop, lifting up his hands and heart to heaven, said a few prayers, which were not long, but fervent and devout: which being ended, he laid his head down over the midst of a little block; here the executioner, being ready with a sharp and heavy axe, cut asunder his slender neck at one blow." *

Of the close of Sir Thomas More's life, there are more abundant materials than of the venerable bishop of Rochester's. From these the following particulars are selected. As soon as his trial had closed, and "he had received sentence of death, he spake thus with a resolute and sedate aspect: 'Well, seeing I am condemned, God knows how justly, I will freely speak, for the disburdening of my conscience, what I think of this law. When I perceived it was the king's pleasure to list out from whence the Pope's authority was derived, I confess I studied seven years together to find out the truth of it, and I could not meet with the works of any one doctor, approved by the Church, that avouched a layman was, or ever could be, the head of the Church.'

"*Chancellor.*—Would you be esteemed wiser, and to have a sincerer conscience than all the bishops, learned doctors, nobility, and commons of this realm?

"*More.*—I am able to produce against one bishop which you can produce on your side, a hundred holy and Catholic bishops for my opinion; and against one realm, the consent of Christendom for a thousand years.

"*Norfolk.*—Sir Thomas, you show your obstinate and malicious mind.

"*More.*—Noble sir, it is no malice or obstinacy that

* See the account by Richard Hall, of Christ Church, Cambridge, a contemporary writer, which Fuller has incorporated in his Hist. of Brit. book v. sect. 4. Another Hall, the Protestant chronicler, a very anti-Catholic writer, has, in the following words, recorded the general impression of Fisher's character and acquirements:—"Fisher was of very many men lamented, for he was reported to be a man of great learning, and a man of very good life."—27th year of Henry VIII.

makes me say this, but the just necessity of the cause obliges me to it for the discharge of my conscience; and I call God to witness, that nothing but this has excited me to it!

"About nine he was brought out of the Tower; his beard was long, his face pale and thin; and carrying a red cross in his hand, he often lifted up his eyes to heaven. A woman meeting him with a cup of wine, he refused it, saying, 'Christ at his passion drank no wine, but gall and vinegar.' Another woman came crying, and demanded some papers she said she had left in his hands when he was lord chancellor, to whom he said, 'Good woman, have patience but for an hour, and the king will rid me of the care I have for those papers, and for everything else.' Another woman followed him, crying, he had done her much wrong when he was lord chancellor; to whom he said, 'I very well remember the cause, and if I were to decide it now, I should make the same decree.'

"When he came to the scaffold, it seemed ready to fall; whereupon he said, merrily, to the lieutenant—'Pray, sir, see me safe up; and as to my coming down, let me shift for myself.' Being about to speak to the people, he was interrupted by the sheriff; and thereupon he only desired the people to pray for him, and bear witness 'he should then suffer death' in and for the faith of the holy Catholic Church: which done, he kneeled down, repeated the Miserere psalm with much devotion; and rising up, the executioner asked him forgiveness. He kissed him, and said, 'Pluck up thy spirits, man, and be not afraid to do thine office; my neck is very short, take heed, therefore, thou strike not awry for saving thine honesty!' Laying his head upon the block, he bid the executioner stay till he had put his beard aside, for that had committed no treason. Thus he suffered with much cheerfulness; his head was taken off at one blow, and was placed upon London Bridge, where having continued for some months, and being about to be thrown into the Thames to make room for others, his daughter

Margaret bought it, inclosed it in a leaden box, and kept it for a relique.' " *

These two illustrious confessors were not, however, the first to shed their blood for the supremacy of the Holy See. Several priors and other monks, as well as a secular priest, had already been hanged and disembowelled alive for the same righteous cause.

The feeling of the whole body of the clergy is thus expressed by no friendly writer: " The bishops generally, and most of the clergy," says Strype, " were so devoted to the Holy See, that, perceiving how the king's proceedings tended not only to the abating, but destroying, the Pope's authority and sway here in England, it sore grieved them."

When, however, the bishops found that to refuse to preach up the new supremacy of the Crown, would cost them not only their earthly comforts, but their lives, not one of them was found to imitate Fisher, and seal his belief with his blood. They, therefore, in obedience to the king's proclamation, began to preach that the Pope's authority as hitherto exercised in England was a usurpation, the king being the real head of the Church.

This tame acquiescence will be the less to be wondered at, when it is remembered that some of the bishoprics were vacant, and that most of the others were either already or very speedily filled with those who, in the negotiations for the divorce, had been the king's most trusted agents. Of these, moreover, seven were notorious abettors of the new doctrines. These were, besides Cranmer—Thomas Goderich, the bishop of Ely; Nicholas Shaxton, of Salisbury; Edward Fox, of Hereford; John Hilsley, of Rochester; and William Barlow, of St. David's; to whom in a few months was added Hugh Latimer, promoted to the see of Worcester for his invectives against the popes.

Latimer, in course of time, became almost as con-

* Compare Roper's Sir Thomas More and State Trials, i. p. 394. The extract in the text is taken *verbatim*, except in one place, from the latter.

spicuous a character as Cranmer, and, indeed, had earned some notoriety whilst Cranmer was as yet unknown. He was a clergyman whose eloquence ran riot in the dangerous style of unrefined and unmitigated invective. Borne away by this darling inclination, he fell rancorously, rather than zealously, upon Luther and his associates. Then rushing into the opposite extreme, he became equally violent in their favour. Being at last summoned before Wolsey, he abjured his errors. Then returning to them, and even defending them, he abjured them a second time, in order to avoid the stake. Again relapsing, he appealed to Henry; and being rejected, acknowledged on his knees, before the bishops in convocation, that since he had "seen his own acts and searched them more deeply," he had, not "only in discretion, but also in doctrine, been seduced."

Such a man, it seems, was the very one for Cromwell, Anne Boleyn, and Cranmer; and he was accordingly patronized, and, at last, was even requested to preach before the king. His rude invectives appear to have delighted "Bluff Hal;" and this the more, because they were now directed against the Holy See. He was rewarded with the see of Worcester (A.D. 1535). During the three or four years in which he enjoyed the king's favour, he was vehemently engaged in the work of change.

He could hardly expect, however, to be thoroughly supported by the clergy. If some, in imitation of the bishops, stood aloof, or assisted in defending the new supremacy, others, on the contrary, had already shown him their zeal for St. Peter's Chair (A.D. 1534). When but a few months previous to his consecration, he made his appearance in Bristol, and began to preach up the royal supremacy, the clergy had preached openly against him in their churches.

The feeling which had thus manifested itself at Bristol existed in so many places, and gave so many proofs of an ardent attachment to the Holy See, that Henry aroused and goaded on his ministers of justice:

"Sundry persons," he wrote to the earl of Sussex, "as well religious as secular priests and curates, do daily, as much as in them is, set forth and extol the jurisdiction and authority of the bishop of Rome, otherwise called pope. Apprehend and take them without bail, until ye shall know our further pleasure in that behalf."

As this proved insufficient to smother the zeal of faithful pastors, Henry issued injunctions to the justices of the peace, commanding "that they, in every place within the precincts of their commission, do make and cause to be made diligent search, wait, and espyal, whether the said bishops and clergy do truly and sincerely, without any manner cloak or dissimulation, execute and accomplish their said charge, upon pain of your allegiances, as ye will avoid our high indignation and displeasure at your uttermost perils." *

* Fox (account of Latimer), pp. 1730, 1736, &c.; Wilk. iii. pp. 748 and 817; Speed, p. 1016, ed. 1632; Strype's Memor. i. pp. 159, 170, and 182, and App. Nos. liii. and liv.; Stowe, an. 1534, p. 570; Herb. at the close of the Articles, A.D. 1536; Fuller's Ch. Hist. sect. 4, No. 30.

CHAPTER VI.

A ROYAL VISITATION—THE EARL OF ESSEX VICAR-GENERAL—THE BISHOPS RECEIVE THEIR JURISDICTION FROM HENRY—CONFISCATION OF THE LESSER MONASTERIES—THE PILGRIMAGE OF GRACE — CONCESSIONS — SECOND PILGRIMAGE FAILS, AND IS PUNISHED BY MARTIAL LAW—POLE DESPATCHED AS LEGATE TO SUPPORT THE DEMANDS OF THE PILGRIMS—HAS A PRICE SET UPON HIS HEAD—A VISITATION OF THE GREATER MONASTERIES —EXECUTION OF SOME OF THE ABBOTS—GLASTONBURY CHURCH AND LIBRARY—IMAGES AND RELICS ASSAILED—ATTEMPT TO DECRY THE FAMOUS RELIC OF HALES ABBEY—PRETENDED TRIAL OF ST. THOMAS OF CANTERBURY—PILLAGE OF HIS SHRINE—THE POPE SIGNS THE BULL OF HENRY'S EXCOMMUNICATION—SUPPRESSION OF THE GREATER MONASTERIES BY ACT OF PARLIAMENT —WANTON DESTRUCTION OF LIBRARIES—DEATH OF CROMWELL—HENRY'S CODE OF DOCTRINE; AND PUNISHMENTS FOR ITS OPPONENTS—HIS PRIMER—BOOK OF ARTICLES AND "INSTITUTE"—CRANMER'S AND LATIMER'S OPPOSITION AND ULTIMATE ADHESION TO THE SIX ARTICLES—LATIMER—THE "DOCTRINE AND ERUDITION"—THE REAL NATURE OF THE DECREES OF CONVOCATION —THE ROYAL SPEECH ON THE DISCORDANT DOCTRINES EVERYWHERE CONTENDED FOR—THE "REFORMERS" PREVAIL IN THE KING'S COUNCIL—DEATH OF HENRY—THE INCONSISTENCY OF HIS EULOGIZERS.

To make the law regarding the royal supremacy a practical fact, and in so doing to crush down all opposition, was the king's next object.* A general

* See (for next p.) Legh and Rice to Crom.; Strype, i. App. No. 57; Strype's Memor. i. pp. 206 and 216. Cromwell first sat at the head of the Convocation in June, 1536 (Fuller, sect. 4, No. 21; and Wilk.). Coll. ii. Records, 31 and 41; Burn. i. book 3, No. 14.

A little incident, preserved by Strype, shows the too officious zeal for some of the new laws of even such a bishop as Tunstall, and at the same time discloses the fact of a silent but active attempt to put the people on their guard:—"There is comen to my hands, a little book printed in English, called 'Ortulus Animæ:' which was brought in by some folks of Newcastle, and as I am informed, there be very many lately brought into the realm.....There is in them a manifest declaration against the effect of the act of parliament lately made for the establishment of the king's highness's succession," &c.—

visitation, with all the forms usual on such occasions, except those by which the royal authority had supplanted that of the Pope, was actively commenced. Cromwell was the king's agent or vicar-general, sitting as chairman of convocation, and taking, on all occasions, precedence of the archbishop of Canterbury (Sept. 1535). He compelled the bishops to surrender to the king all their power of jurisdiction, and to remain without it during the visitation, as if they had been subjected to the penalty of suspension (Nov. 1539). When they were reinvested, it was in the king's name, with authority to ordain priests, and discharge all the other duties of bishops. Whilst they became the servile instruments of this new exercise of royal power, they were significantly told, that could the vicar-general (a layman, be it remembered) attend to all the wants of the various dioceses, the services of the bishops would be altogether dispensed with.

Thus it gradually became evident, as the visitation proceeded, that it was not intended to enforce greater strictness of discipline, but to exact a more complete submission to the new supremacy. Another object, or at least result, of the visitation, was to make out a charge of immorality against the monasteries, and so to suppress them. "The refractoriness of those of the Benedictine order to the king's proceedings," says Strype, "made him think it convenient to look a little more narrowly into their behaviour." When such words express the intentions of a tyrannical ruler, they have but one, and that an obvious, meaning.

Whether this design arose from resentment at the opposition already made by some of the religious orders, or from cupidity, or from other such motives, certain is it that the instructions furnished to the visitors were particularly emphatic on the point of exacting a distinct acknowledgment that Henry was supreme head of the Church of England, and that the Pope was no more than any other bishop, being

Letter from "Tonstal, bishop of Durham, to the Lord Crumwel," App. to Strype's Memor. v. i. No. 78.

bishop, it was added, of the diocese of Rome only: equally certain is it that the letters of the various agents employed in this business, disclose a system of brow-beating, sowing of dissension, exciting of scandalous rumours, employed against the monks by the government, almost unparalleled. Few are the communities that have no enemies whatever, or some of whose neighbours, for money or a minister's promises, would not contrive to invent some tale of scandal. This Cromwell knew well. This his emissaries well knew. This is almost all that their letters could show. What was often wanting in detailed statements could easily be supplied by rumours and charges, vague indeed, but likely to produce an impression from being constantly repeated.

When the country had been thus made to ring with reports and accusations, and a Black Book filled with such charges had been delivered to Henry, a bill was introduced into parliament to make over to the king every convent of which the annual income was not greater than two hundred pounds. The king was to have the power of restoring any of them, or granting them to whom he pleased by letters patent. The greater monasteries were spared, because it was acknowledged that they were everything that could be wished.*

Was it likely, then, that the poorer or less numerous, whose temptations must have been less, were worse

* Strype's Memor. vol. i. c. 29. See also the Letters of the Visitors, Camd. Soc. Wright, the editor of this collection, has a most hostile spirit against the monks, as his preface shows. The collection, then, which he made, will, we may rest assured, contain the pith of everything which he could find against them. Yet, so few are the charges really brought home, that the result, to an unbiassed mind, must surely be an honourable acquittal. See the Author's article, "Suppression of Monasteries," in the *Dublin Review*, No. 31, 1844. On another ground, however, they cannot be so easily acquitted: the rule was too generally relaxed. See one instance, that of Durham, in Appendix A; for the action of the civil wars upon the Cistercian monasteries, Steph. Monast. ii. p. 28; and for the time of the Reformation itself, see Pole, fol. c. iiii.:—"Qui non prorsus .....degeneraverint?"

than their more wealthy brethren? The Commons seem to have thought not. They certainly recoiled from the measure, until, if we are to believe Spelman, the king threatened that he would either have the bill or some of their heads. They now (alas for British freedom!) submitted and passed the bill. Thus were extinguished about two hundred religious houses. Some fifty or sixty that had been equally included purchased a temporary exemption. Pitiable was it to see the scattering of libraries, the hurrying away of consecrated plate, the stripping off of leaded roofs, and the general waste and dilapidation, to say nothing of the feelings as well of monks and nuns, as of numerous relatives or dependents.

The nation was amazed at so cruel an injustice; but knowing that, under such a king, there was but one remedy, however desperate, it did not consume its spirit in empty discussions, but flew to arms at once. The men of Lincolnshire were among the first to unfurl their banner. So numerous, so determined were they, that Suffolk, the king's lieutenant, thought proper to treat. The result was, that some laid down their arms, whilst many others joined the men of the north; for now almost the whole population from the Humber to the borders of Scotland was banding together in arms. They bound themselves by oath to stand by one another to the death, in the cause of God and his Church, and do nothing for private gain or feud. They had no thought of shaking the throne: they required that the royal person and issue should be preserved; that the visitors who had been so malignantly busy about the monasteries should be punished; that the king's evil counsellors should be removed; that the new statutes, for the last subsidy, for misprision of treason, and regarding the Pope's jurisdiction and other spiritual matters, should be repealed; and that the monks should be reinstated in their ancient possessions (Oct. 1536).

As the armed multitude gathered and marched along to the number of forty thousand men, they

termed their march the Pilgrimage of Grace. They wore as a badge upon their sleeves the five wounds, with the holy name in the midst. Their banners displayed the host and chalice, the crucifix, and the five wounds. York, Pontefract, and Hull opened their gates to them. Not until they reached Doncaster was any resistance offered. There the duke of Norfolk, the duke of Suffolk, the earl of Shrewsbury, and the marquis of Exeter, were prepared with an army to receive them.

An armistice followed; and on the king's promise that the demands of the insurgents should be submitted to a parliament at York, this formidable array broke up and disappeared.*

Henry was not the man to care much for promises. As soon as the pilgrims disappeared, he increased his forces in the north, and posted them in so central a position as to be able to prevent a junction between the men of the various districts. Seeing this, and seeing that there was no intention of calling a parliament, the people again flew to arms, and began their second pilgrimage. The king's precautions, however, were effectual. The people were attacked in detail, first in the neighbourhood of Carlisle, then near Hull; and, in short, wherever they began to show any strength. After several desperate encounters, the rising was thus suppressed, and was punished with the death of hundreds; the duke of Norfolk, with royal banner displayed, executing "martial law," says Herbert, "where he thought it needful" (Feb. 1537). But four years later, a new commotion in Yorkshire was stifled in another torrent of blood.

* Henry and Cromwell, in despatches full of misstatements, endeavoured, through the English ambassadors at the court of France, to make the continental princes think the matter very trifling, and to attribute the notorious fact of the royal forces being "commanded to retire" to the king's merciful policy! As to the parliament, it is true the rebels petitioned for one; but they afterwards "remitted the same wholly to the king's majesty."—See Cromwell's despatch of Dec. 24, 1536, in Tierney's Dodd, vol. i. App. No. 44. Compare also Hall, 28th Hen. VIII., Stowe and Herbert, although their accounts are evidently biassed.

Paul III., who had now succeeded Clement, on hearing of the Pilgrimage of Grace, and of the promised parliament, and having understood that Henry's alarm had made him really desirous of abandoning his schism, despatched Cardinal Pole, an Englishman, a near relative of Henry's, to Flanders, as papal legate; enjoining him to encourage the pilgrims, and to aid them, if necessary, with money, until he could induce the king both to allow his people to remain unmolested in their obedience to Rome, and to abandon himself his schismatical career.* As no parliament was called, and the second pilgrimage was at once quelled, Pole's commission was abortive. It drew upon him the marked hostility of Henry. Before he was made cardinal, Pole had written an able and eloquent work on the Unity of the Church, showing plainly the sinfulness of Henry's career; but the English king, concealing his displeasure, had pressed the writer to return to England. Pole, however, knew the king's temper, and wisely remained out of danger. Henry, however, showed no resentment; but as soon as he heard that Pole was entering France as papal legate, he set a price upon his head, and was ever after his implacable enemy. As if to gratify his disappointed vengeance, he put to death, on the most frivolous charges, his own kinsmen, the brothers and other relations of Pole, including his aged mother, the countess of Salisbury.†

The proceedings against the monks, meantime, were far from being terminated by the suppression of the lesser monasteries. When the second pilgrimage of grace had failed, preparations began for confiscating all the remaining possessions of the monks. A new visitation was begun, and all the arts which had been

* Hardwick's Miscell. State Papers (printed in 1778), i. pp. 27, 43, &c.; Beccatelli's Life of Pole. Beccatelli was long intimately acquainted with Pole. The Pope believed that Henry, in his alarm, had become desirous of a reconciliation. That this desire was an actual fact, Gardiner, who must have known, positively declared.—See his sermon in Pole, Ep. v. 293, &c.; Fox, iii. 92, 448.

† Ib.; Stowe and Herbert.

employed previous to the former suppression, were now renewed. Every effort was made for many months, not only to blacken the character of the religious, but by bribes and promises, to lead, if possible, to a voluntary surrender. Sometimes, when everything else failed, the Gordian knot was severed at once. In the interval between the suppression of the lesser monasteries and the pilgrimage of grace (July, 1536), a refusal of the oath of supremacy when legally tendered, had been declared high treason. This, or some illusory charge, was the decisive instrument now employed against all that were firm in their duty: the oath of supremacy was tendered to the superior, and sometimes to others, and if refused, was followed by their execution, and then by the seizure of the property of the establishment. Thus was it with the abbots of Reading, Glastonbury, and Colchester: they were uncompromising in their fidelity to the Holy See, and were martyred; "all," says Stowe, "for denying the king's supremacy."*

Richard Whiting was the martyred abbot of Glastonbury; a man, we are told, of "great prudence and judgment." Being a firm opposer of the Reformation, he was not dealt with in the usual way, but being seized at his manor-house at Sharpham, he was charged with the most improbable of all crimes, that of robbing his own church of Glastonbury (A.D. 1539). To prove the charge, was quite another thing; but a form of trial would have some resemblance to a proved fact; and this having been gone through at Wells, the doomed abbot was summarily condemned, was dragged on a hurdle to the Tor-hill, overhanging the monastery, and there, without being allowed to take leave of his community, was publicly hanged along with two of his monks.

The church of Glastonbury, a triumph of religion and art, was in length, including the noble chapel of St. Joseph of Arimathea, no less than five hundred

* Stowe, p. 577; see letters of Visit. referred to in p. 76.

and thirty feet. It is now a scanty ruin. "The floors were inlaid with Norman tile, inscribed with Scripture sentences," and the names of benefactors. They are now a green sward, inclosed by the crumbling remains of the once sculptured and massive walls. The library was scarcely equalled in Britain; but it has, long since, been scattered to the winds.*

During the two years of this so-called visitation, and its noisy accompaniment of brow-beating, menaces, expulsions, and executions, the visitors, whether to please a king who had been negotiating with the Lutherans, or whether, at least, they knew that he longed not only for monastic treasures, but for the costly shrines with which the cathedrals and other churches abounded, endeavoured by ridicule, and reiterated tales, and brazen assertions, to destroy the veneration of the people for relics and holy images. If an image long the object of pilgrimage was dark, and by no means beautiful to the bodily eye, it was exposed to the vulgar with ill-timed merriment, and then consigned to the flames or shivered to atoms. The use of such images being to excite devotion towards the saint thus represented, it matters little whether it be the veriest log or a miracle of art. What excites devotion in one, has no effect upon another. What suits the refined, is found to have few attractions for the uneducated. Therefore, unseasonable and ill-grounded, as well as profane, was the mirth of the modern iconoclasts.

Few were more busy in this unedifying work than Latimer of Worcester. A friar, named Dr. Forest, was condemned for denying the royal supremacy. Whether for having formerly taken the oath which he now refused, or for some charge of heresy, such as it was, he was doomed to the flames. A large wooden statue of the blessed Virgin was brought from Wales to make the death-fire. Latimer himself presided at this twofold execution, preaching to the poor

* See Russell's letter, &c. in Dugdale, i. pp. 7—10, Lond. 1846.

friar, says Stowe, as he hung suspended in the flames. When the bishop had exhausted his eloquence, he asked the half-consumed victim, "what state he would die in." He must have been surprised at the loud bold voice with which the friar told him, "that if an angel should come down from heaven and teach him any other doctrine than he had received and believed from his youth, he would not now believe him." He added that the bishop, but seven years before, "durst not have made such a sermon for his life. And so he was hanged and burnt."

Amongst the relics which were produced and insulted, was one which had been considered the greatest treasure of the monastery of Hales, in Gloucestershire (Nov. 1538). This was a portion of Christ's sacred blood. The eldest son of the earl of Cornwall, and nephew of Henry III., had brought it from Palestine, and had bestowed part upon the abbey of Hales, and the rest upon that of Ashbridge, in Buckinghamshire, which he himself had founded.

This relic was handled and examined, in presence of a great multitude, by Latimer and other royal commissioners. They declared under their hands and seals, that "by force of the view and other trials thereof, we think, deem, and judge the substance of the said supposed relic to be an unctuous gum and coloured." Such a surmise by such men, was, after some time, deemed to be not telling enough for the purposes of the reformers. The author of "Il Pelerine Inglese," a clerk of the council of Edward VI., with an effrontery which a Catholic pen hesitates to record, dared therefore to assert that the relic was the blood of a duck. This assertion, Fox, Herbert, Fuller, and other Protestant writers, have repeated almost verbatim.* Collier, the non-juring Anglican,

* Stowe, p. 574; Ribadeneira's Hist. p. 84 (1588). Herbert, on some occasions, being certainly more ingenuous than some of his predecessors, betrays a little distrust of his authorities, and therefore quotes the above-mentioned clerk's account of St. Thomas, "leaving to every man yet the choice of believing what relation he pleaseth."

has shown the fallacy of some part of their statements; whilst Hearne, the industrious collector of historical documents, Protestant as he is, has printed an "authentic evidence," containing the commissioners' report of the relic, together with an account of the various statements regarding it, and sums up with the following words: "Upon the whole matter, as far as appears, the charge of imposture does not lie against this abbey, with relation to this noted relic."*

Such an opinion, uttered by such men, is conclusive. It is one more proof of the too ready credulity, to give it no harsher name, of the earlier historians of the Reformation, and a sufficient specimen of the amount of calm truth and justice to be expected from such a class of visitors.

Having thus excited a feeling against relics, Henry, as if he felt that the memory of St. Thomas was a reproach to his own despotism, commanded the martyr's remains to be removed from their shrine, to be subjected to a mock trial, and, finally, to be burnt and scattered to the winds. The shrine was, of course, committed to the royal treasury: "the spoil of which shrine, in gold and precious stones," says Stowe, "filled two great chests, such as six or seven strong men could do no more than convey, one of them at once, out of the church." A precious stone of rare beauty, with which Louis VII. of France had amongst other gifts enriched the shrine, was actually put into a ring, and publicly worn by the royal and unblushing plunderer.†

The Holy See was by no means unmoved at this long series of profane and sacrilegious deeds. Seeing how ruthlessly the king was endeavouring to force his people into schism, Paul III., even before the Pilgrim-

This faint admission, however, is too slight a counterpoise to the gross fabrications which, with little or no discrimination, he palms upon readers made more than usually unguarded, by his reminding them that his authorities were contemporaries.

* See addenda to Ben. of Peterborough's Life of Hen. II. and Rich. I. vol. ii. p. 751, &c.

† Hall, 30th Hen. VIII.; Stowe, 575; Herbert.

age of Grace, had prepared to utter against Henry the strongest censures of the Church.

The instrument in which these censures were announced, recapitulated, according to custom, the crimes of which it was intended to be at once the spiritual punishment and remedy. Henry, it observed, had publicly, "in the face of the Church," contracted matrimony with Catherine; and several children were the fruit of this marriage. Yet, after many years of wedlock, he had dismissed Catherine without any lawful cause, and had married Anne Boleyn, notwithstanding the prohibition of the Church. What was still worse, he had enacted laws to compel his subjects to receive various heretical and schismatical articles, and especially to deny the supremacy of the Holy See; and to acknowledge himself to be supreme head "in the Anglican Church." Some who were intrepid enough to refuse to assent, he shut up in prison; and by putting to death the bishop of Rochester, whose constancy in the faith and holiness of life had obtained for him the dignity of cardinal, the king incurred the sentence of excommunication published by Boniface VIII. and Honorius III., and had rendered himself unworthy to reign. After this recapitulation, Paul declared, that if Henry and his abettors did not amend and submit, they would incur, on the expiration of an assigned term, the greater excommunication, the king's subjects being no longer bound by their oath of allegiance; that the kingdom was placed under an interdict; and that all prelates and clergy, both secular and regular, should quit a kingdom where they could no longer suitably or safely discharge their functions, leaving only a sufficient number of priests to administer baptism to infants, penance to the dying, and such other ecclesiastical rites as were usual in the time of an interdict.

The instrument closed with an injunction to the nobles to expel the king, and to all Christian princes to withdraw from his alliance; and to the prelates, chapters, and other ecclesiastical authorities, to take

care that the excommunication was announced to the people (Aug. 30, 1535).

The mere knowledge that such a document was prepared, might have some effect. Such, at least, was the representation made to Paul by several princes. The Pope, therefore, deferred its publication; three years passed, and the tyranny of Henry against the Church had frightfully increased. Still a few more months, and then Paul considered it his duty to delay no longer. He published another bull, embodying the whole of the former. It thus began:—

"Our Redeemer, to teach us to be merciful, appointed Peter, who had denied him, to be the ruler of the whole Church. Assuredly, then, the successors of St. Peter ought to be especially merciful. When, however, mercy has been exerted towards one who becomes more obstinate, and is dragging others along with himself to destruction, it is the duty of the Roman Pontiff to amputate a putrid limb, in order to save the other members from contagion. Such is our duty towards Henry.

"Unwilling to believe the repeated charges made against him, we gave him time to clear himself; and again, when several princes entreated for further delay, assuring us that they had hopes of his submission, we deferred the execution of the bull of excommunication. Instead, however, of improvement, there is far greater guilt. Multitudes of priests have been slaughtered, and the very dead have been insulted; the bones of St. Thomas have been burnt, and scattered to the winds. It is time to cut off the putrid limb. Let, therefore, the previous bull be now published. We are told it will be more easily known if published in the cities of adjoining countries, than in England itself. Let this be done, and be as binding as if it were published in the king's own presence" (Dec. 17, 1538).*

* Magn. Bullar. Herbert tells us that this bull was not only signed but published, being set up "in divers places of Flanders, France, and Scotland."

Soon after the signing of this bull, Henry completed his prolonged visitation of the greater monasteries, and introduced a bill for their suppression (May, 1539). The praise so lately accorded, was now superseded by a charge of general immorality. To induce a more ready acquiescence in the measure, the ministers asserted that the king would thus be enabled to defray his ordinary expenses, and to defend himself without aid from the Commons, with an army of forty thousand men. Such an appeal ought, one would think, to have alarmed and aroused the little spirit of freedom that still survived. Not in the least: the bill quietly passed the lower house. It reached the Lords; and although, despite of the recent executions, there were amongst them, besides the bishops, two priors and eight-and-twenty abbots, there was yet no opposition: the spirit of the olden time was dead.

The king put his unsparing hand to the bill, and immediately the work of destruction began. The religious houses still untouched were probably more than eight hundred. They were the ornaments of the country, so beautiful was their structure. They were both treasures and nurseries not only of virtue, but of the fine arts, and of every kind of knowledge. No matter: let no one plead for them, or he will rue it. The king's warrant is enough. The axe and crowbar are applied, and all is ruin. Property, which had belonged neither to the king nor his parliament, is thus seized, only to be made a general wreck.* Precious manuscripts were left in the ruined cloisters, to be pilfered by every passenger, or tossed by the autumnal winds, and rotted by the snows of winter.

* The mere transfer, in so rude a fashion, of so many thousands of acres, to say nothing of moveables, must have been a social revolution hitherto unexampled. The thousands of artists, mechanics, and labourers employed by the monasteries were reduced to beggary. The few that had become the owners of the monastic lands, expelled a tenantry whose very looks must have been a constant reproach; and turned vast tracts of arable land into parks or sheepwalks.—See Report of the Royal Commissioners at beginning of Edward VI. Appendix AA. See also Appendix B.

Even so late as 1574, nearly forty years after this deed of Vandalism, the destruction of these treasures, the accumulations of centuries, was not yet completed. In a letter written in that year, Dr. John Dee assures his patron, Lord Burghley, that during a recent visit to Wigmore Castle, he "espied an heap of old papers and parchments, obligations, acquittances, accounts, &c. (in time past belonging to the abbey of Wigmore), and there to lie rotting, spoiled, and tossed, in an old decayed chapel, not committed to any man's special charge, but three-quarters of them, I understand, to have been taken away by divers (either tailors or others), in times past." *

Whilst the interests of learning were thus sacrificed, the interests of the poor were equally trampled upon. The patrons of the religious houses had little establishments attached to some of the monasteries, where their aged servants might have their way to the grave smoothened by both the spiritual and temporal ministration of the religious. The poor in general, moreever, found in the monks able teachers for their children, liberal employers for themselves, physicians for all. To the tenant, they were landlords who never sought to wring from him the utmost amount of rent, and yet were themselves models for improvement in the culture of land. Thus are the monks described by contemporaries, and this testimony is confirmed by the inventories and other documents that are still extant. No matter; the king's decree is issued, and the monasteries, and with them the hopes and the rights of many thousands, are destroyed. "The townspeople and households miserably decayed," are Bale's expressive words.

The jewels and plate that thus enriched the king's coffers must have been enormous. They are supposed,

* Sir H. Ellis's Orig. Lett. of Emin. Lit. Men, No. xii.; Dugd. Monast. vol. i. pp. 7 and 10 (1846). Ample confirmation of this wanton carelessness or actual destruction may be found in note to page 87; and still more in the pages of Bale, Stowe, Strype, Fuller, &c.

on a very moderate estimate, to have been worth one hundred and fifty thousand pounds. The rental of the confiscated lands produced about the same amount every year. The moveables, which had accumulated for so great a number of years, must have added a large sum. Yet all was soon wasted, partly on rapacious courtiers, partly in riot and gambling, and the very immoralities which had been alleged against the monks. Henry was actually not ashamed to demand from parliament, to which he had promised an exemption from all future taxation, a large subsidy for the expenses of government (May, 1540).*

Cromwell, who had been the chief instrument in these iniquitous transactions, had been created earl of Essex, and had appropriated, out of the spoils of the monasteries, no fewer than thirty manors, and appeared securely established in his new and dazzling fortunes. Scarcely, however, had the monasteries been swept away, when the judgment of God fell upon him. Cromwell had induced Henry to marry Anne of Cleves. The king did so; but having conceived a dislike for her at first sight, turned his anger upon Cromwell. He

* Stowe says that the money was granted for building block-houses; but the statute mentions various items. Strype (quoting Bale, who was an apostate monk), Mem. i. p. 346. Again quoting Bale, Strype says (i. p. 385): "Great pity it was, and a most irreparable loss, that, notwithstanding this provision, most of the ancient MS. histories and writings of learned British and Saxon authors were lost. Libraries were sold by mercenary men for anything they could get, in that confusion and devastation of religious houses. Bale, the antiquary, makes mention of a merchant that bought two noble libraries about these times for forty shillings, the books whereof served him for no other use but for waste paper; and that he had been ten years consuming them, and yet there remained still store enough for as many years more."

Camden could see in the persecution of the monks but one cause, their resolute adherence to the Holy See; and in the destruction of their monasteries still but one cause, avarice:—"Religiosos ob pervicaciam in pontificia potestate asserenda proditorum supplicio crebrius afficit, et ex avaritia, monasteria majora, ut antea minora, venerandæ vetustatis et majestatis plenissima diruit, opesque tot annos congestas diripit, causis ex humanæ fragilitatis vitiis, et solutiore vita quæsitis."—Apparat. ad Elizab.

arrested him at the very council-board; charged him with betraying his duty as vicar-general, and encroaching on the royal prerogative; and by a bill of attainder, the unjust procedure which Cromwell himself had devised against the countess of Salisbury, doomed him to the scaffold. Thus perished the direct author of the schism, the first vicar-general of the new supreme head (July, 1540). The poor wretch died, however, lamenting his wickedness, thanking God for appointing such a death for his sins, and protesting that he died "in the Catholic faith of the Holy Church."

Henry himself was, meanwhile, enforcing upon his subjects his own views of doctrine, being resolved to be in every way supreme head. Under various pretences, or with terms calculated to excite contempt against religion, he abolished many holidays; removed from the litanies the invocations of the saints; from the church offices all commemoration of St. Thomas of Canterbury; and from the churches themselves the images of saints, and the tapers lighted at shrines. Yet, after all, he remained for some months uncertain what further course to pursue. For a time, he leaned to the Lutherans, and opened negotiations with their leaders (A.D. 1539). He at last returned in great measure to the doctrines taught by the Catholic Church. All who held different doctrines from those which he propounded were declared by act of parliament heretics, and for a third offence were doomed to the stake and fagot. All who, from the fact of being Catholics, held the same, or apparently the same as himself, and yet denied that he was supreme head, were still condemned, as traitors, to be hanged, drawn, and quartered. All, moreover, who in any way befriended those that denied the royal supremacy, were subjected to the punishment of a præmunire. For such an offence, Richard Farmer, a wealthy citizen, was imprisoned, and his family stripped of everything, and "thrust out of doors;" and at the same time, Dr. Sampson, the bishop

of Chichester, was arrested, and shut up in the Tower.*

He had begun to tamper with the doctrine of the Church as early as 1535. In that year he published a prayer-book, known as King Henry's Primer. It contained many things savouring of heresy: passages, for instance, that tended to depreciate prayers for the dead, and the belief in the intercession of the saints.

In the following year, he published, as a standard of orthodoxy, the "Book of Articles," inculcating the three creeds, auricular confession in the "sacrament of penance," the use of images and of the received rites and ceremonies of the Church, the invocation of saints, and the real presence and purgatory (A.D. 1536). In order that these articles might be understood and expounded, the "Godly and Pious Institute of a Christian Man" was drawn up (A.D. 1537). In the same parliament in which the greater monasteries were suppressed, the statute of Six Articles was enacted (about midsummer, A.D. 1539). It propounded the real presence, the non-necessity of receiving under both kinds, celibacy, the obligation of keeping vows of chastity, private masses, and auricular confession. The punishment for denying the first was that of the stake, and for denying the others, the imprisonment and forfeiture of felony. Before these articles were introduced into parliament, they were debated by the bishops in convocation. Cranmer had signed the former articles, but he contended strenuously against the new code. Indeed, having been himself privately married for more that six years, and that for the second time, he was personally interested. He, therefore, supported the bishops of Ely, Salisbury, Worcester, Rochester, and St. David's, in a decided opposition. When, however, Henry himself made his appearance, stating his own opinion, in his lordly style, Cranmer, and all the other bishops but Salisbury, demurred no

* Strype's Memor. i. c. 42, 43, 45, 47, p. 320, &c.; Stowe, p. 580, and passim; Herbert; Stat. of the Realm, 31 Hen. VIII. c. 14; and 35 Hen. VIII. c. i. Nos. 7—10, and 17; and c. 5, and passim.

longer, but expressed and supported opinions the very opposite to those which they had so publicly maintained.*

Henry punished the opposition not only of Shaxton of Salisbury, but also that of Latimer of Worcester. Latimer was a man who delighted in coarse invective, and who, therefore, could not so easily obliterate or disguise his own language as the more cautious Cranmer. His adhesion to the articles, therefore, came too late. He shared Shaxton's imprisonment. He craved pardon, and yielded back his see, but his submission could never entirely disarm the king's anger. His see was given to another, and he himself, although, it seems, released, was soon again under arrest, and was left in prison as long as Henry lived.

About four years later, appeared what is known as the King's Book, entitled the "Necessary Doctrine and Erudition of any Christened Man," being indeed only an enlarged and amended edition of the Institute (A.D. 1543).

In all these works, except the Primer, Catholic doctrines were, more or less exactly, taught; but the royal supremacy in matters spiritual as well as temporal, and the most passive obedience to the king, whether he were right or wrong, were strongly and repeatedly inculcated. Hitherto England had received for its

* Fox, and those who have blindly copied him, tell us that Cranmer persisted to the last in his opposition to the Six Articles. Fox adds that Cranmer held out to the last against the king, and with such mildness and force of argument, that Henry "only willed him to depart out of the parliament-house for a time (for the safeguard of his conscience), till the act should pass"! (p. 1136). The gross inaccuracies continually to be discovered in Fox would make one hesitate before ever receiving his testimony. In the present case, however, he has been clearly refuted by Lingard, on the testimony of one of the lords commissioners, who was present at the discussion, and records its termination.—(Ling. Hen. VIII. chap. ii. note p. 128; 1849.) Herbert adds, that Latimer of Worcester and Shaxton of Salisbury resigned their bishoprics, "they being unwilling, it seems, to have a hand in the approbation or execution of them." He is incorrect, however, regarding Latimer, as the contemporary writer already referred to expressly says that all assented, except Salisbury.

faith whatever the Catholic Church proposed; and what the Catholic Church proposed, it sought from the Holy See. Now it was compelled to receive whatever Henry decreed. The Convocation nominally discussed the decrees; but it was Henry's servile instrument. The Book of Articles, for instance, begins thus:—"Henry VIII., by the grace of God king of England and of France, Defensor of the Faith, lord of Ireland, and in earth Supreme Head of the Church of England; to all and singular our most loving, faithful, and obedient subjects, greeting." Then follow the definitions of doctrine; and in the midst of these definitions occurs again and again the significant passage:—"We will that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach our people committed by us unto their spiritual charge, that they ought and must constantly believe," &c. &c. The principle of belief, then, as well as the acknowledgment of supremacy, was no longer the same—was essentially changed.* A fearful commentary did Henry unintentionally make upon the consequences of his own schismatical career, when, towards the close of his profligate life, he thus, in parliament, undertook to be the upholder of charity, pure doctrine, and morality:—"Charity and concord is not among you; but discord and dissension beareth rule in every place. I hear daily that you of the clergy preach one against another, without charity or discretion; some be too stiff in their old mumpsimus, others be too busy and curious in their new sumpsimus. Amend these crimes I exhort you, or else I, whom God hath appointed his vicar and high minister here, will see these divisions extinct. I am sorry," he continued, "to know and hear how irreverently that precious jewel, the word of God, is disputed, rhymed, sung, and jangled in every ale-house

* Strype's Mem. i. c. 31, p. 217, &c., and c. 41, 47, and 50, pp. 315, 351, 378, &c. Compare Fox, Stowe, and Herb.; State Papers, i. No. 246; Fuller's Ch. Hist. cent. 16, sect. 4, Nos. 34, 35, and sect. 5, No. 18; Stat. of the Realm, 31 Hen. VIII. c. 14; Journ. of the Lords, vol. i. 31 Hen. VIII. June 10.

and tavern, contrary to the true meaning and doctrine of the same; and yet I am as much sorry that the readers of the same follow it in doing so faintly and so coldly. For of this I am sure, that charity was never so faint among you, and virtuous and godly living was never less used, nor God himself among Christians never less served" (Dec. 24, 1545).* Henry's own conduct showed how much more easy it is to open, than afterwards to close, the flood-gates of the passions. The tide, therefore, rolled on, heedless of royal commands, and spreading a wider ruin in almost each successive reign, until, for a time, the throne itself was swept away.

Henry, however, lived but to witness the first, and comparatively harmless, pressure of what he had thus let loose. Being excessive in his eating and drinking, he had become so corpulent, that when he wished to go from one floor of the palace to another, he was obliged to make use of machinery. An ulcer in his thigh was, at the same time, devouring the remaining strength of his constitution. Anxiety added to his many infirmities. He feared for the safety of Edward his son, a boy of only nine years of age. Those who had any of the blood royal in their veins—the duke of Buckingham and the numerous family of the Poles—had been unjustly consigned to the block: no natural protectors were left for the heir who had been sought through so much blood and sin. It was therefore necessary to intrust the guardianship either to a council of the great nobles, or, as the only remaining alternative, to those men of inferior rank, the Seymours, the brothers of the Lady Jane, who had been lately knighted, and the elder of whom had been created earl of Hertford and governor of Boulogne.

Old constitutional usage might plead for the former, and Henry's first will decided accordingly; but the Seymours knew well how to awaken the despot's jealousy, and to work upon his fears and weaknesses. The result quickly appeared. Norfolk and his son,

* Hall.

the earl of Surrey, were suddenly imprisoned on a futile charge of high treason. The earl was beheaded, and Norfolk only escaped, first by an abject submission, and then by the intervention of Henry's death. Gardiner, too, was in peril; but knowing well the royal character, contrived to elude his enemies, by a prompt submission to the king's pleasure.

He was, however, struck out of the king's will, as were also Norfolk and Thirlby, the bishop of Westminster, one of Henry's new sees. The king had thus decided for the Seymours; and in deciding for them, he knew that he was confiding his son to the mixed Lutheran and Calvinistic reformers, of whom the Seymours and Cranmer were the real but not the acknowledged chiefs.

What the sentiments of the dying monarch might have been, we may surmise, but cannot clearly learn; so contradictory are the received accounts, and so completely was he hedged in by the triumphant Seymours. He expired towards the close of January, 1547.*

Some of those who had profited by his injustice, had been accustomed to pour out before his very face the most contemptible flattery, and continued to pour the same fulsome praises into the ears of his children. Sir Richard Morison was not ashamed to speak in the following terms of a man who broke the heart of his first queen; beheaded the second; and having lost the third in childbirth, conceived, at first sight, an antipathy to the fourth, and in six months divorced her, giving her the title of his adopted sister; married a fifth, and in six months beheaded her on a charge of adultery; and prepared a similar fate for the sixth and last, for interfering in matters of doctrine: "Who is there so dull," says Sir Richard, "or so barbarous, as not to see in that most serene countenance, the signs of a king? Who ever could see, even at a distance, that forehead, that face, and not acknowledge it the seat of clemency?"

* Hall, Sand., Stowe, and Herbert.

It would seem impossible that any considerable number of men, however prejudiced, could thus belie innumerable facts. And yet such is the received character which Herbert scarcely dares to uphold, and yet more or less defends; and which Strype has complacently recorded. It would seem to have been, for many years, a sign of attachment to the Anglican Establishment, thus to depict the character of its founder. Posterity has, at last, shaken off this tutelage, and fully avenged itself upon the tyrant's memory.*

* Hall; Stowe, p. 581, &c.; Herb. passim; Strype's Memor. i. c. 53. Strype's only reference to the royal villany, in his "Review" of the king's character, is this remarkable one:—"And first, in excuse for the king's vices, he (Sir Thomas Chaloner) hath these words:—

> "Quo minus id mirum est, si fortunatior et rex,
> Indulsit genio, admittens quandoque proterva
> At non immani veniam superantia facto"!

CHAPTER VII.

CONDUCT AND SCHEMES OF CRANMER AND HERTFORD—GRADUAL CHANGES—THE INJUNCTIONS — GARDINER'S OPPOSITION AND IMPRISONMENT — A NEW VISITATION — THE HOMILIES — ALL PREACHERS TO BE LICENSED—STATUTES—NEW CONFISCATIONS AND A NEW LITURGY—OPPOSITION OF THE PAROCHIAL CLERGY—THE TRADITION OF THE CHURCH IN ENGLAND REGARDING THE BLESSED VIRGIN—POPULAR TUMULTS—OPEN REVOLT—TRIUMPH, SACRILEGE, DISGRACE, AND DEATH OF HERTFORD OR SOMERSET —TWENTY GRAMMAR-SCHOOLS ERECTED OUT OF THE SUPPRESSED HOSPITALS, GUILDS, AND CHANTRIES—THE REAL APPLICATION OF MOST OF THE BOOTY—PILLAGE OF CATHEDRALS AND PARISH CHURCHES.

As long as Henry lived, Cranmer was his passive instrument, not only in his various divorces, but in receiving and promulgating his code of doctrine. He was the head of the party that sought a union with the German reformers; and yet, as if passive obedience would atone for everything, he submitted to Henry's dictation, as soon as the latter declared himself the advocate of the ancient faith.

When Henry was no more, and his son, Edward VI., was upon the throne (Jan. 28th, 1547), Cranmer had no further need of disguise or subterfuge: his own party were in power. He himself, along with the earl of Hertford, the maternal uncle of the king, Sir John Russel, and other "new men," who had beset the death-bed of Henry, now appeared before the parliament, and produced a document which they said was Henry's will, and by which, doubted as it was by many, they were appointed the royal executors, and formed the Council of Regency. It was soon discovered by some of this council, that one of the number ought to be selected to represent the king's person, with the title of Protector. This was both contrary

to the will, and to an oath which they had just taken to observe the very letter of that document. The suggestion was, nevertheless, adopted; and Hertford was named Protector and Guardian. It then transpired, that the late king had intended to shower titles and pensions upon Hertford and his colleagues. This intention, of course, was not neglected: Hertford was created duke of Somerset; his brother, Sir Thomas Seymour, was made a baron; and the rest were favoured in proportion. To procure pensions was not quite so easy; but as all knew Henry's resource in difficulties, the members of the council helped themselves in no stinted measure out of the revenues of bishoprics and canonries, and other possessions of the Church. Having then eliminated from their body those that were not inclined to submit to the dictatorship of Somerset, they proceeded cautiously, but not the less promptly, to introduce the so-called Reformation.

Under pretence of checking seditious discourses, all clergymen, unless in their own cures, were forbidden, under pain of imprisonment, to preach without the license of Somerset, or Cranmer, or the bishop of the diocese. It would be easy enough in a month or two to omit any mention of either "their own cures" or the bishop. On the day after this proclamation, Cranmer, acting in the same spirit, publicly announced that his ecclesiastical authority had expired with the life of Henry, and therefore petitioned the crown for a renewal of jurisdiction (Feb. 7th, 1547). The greater part, and probably the whole of the bishops, imitated their crafty metropolitan. In the following Lent, the people were told that the fast was not enjoined by God, but merely by men, and that therefore they need not observe it.

Whilst the council, meantime, was urging forward its preparations for the contemplated change, having issued royal injunctions for removing images from the churches, and being particularly busy in drawing up a Book of Homilies, Gardiner, who had already striven

to check the defacing of images and the publication of various heretical works, wrote strong remonstrances both to Cranmer and Somerset. Cranmer wished to obtain his co-operation in drawing up the intended Homilies, but Gardiner spurned the offer. Finding, at the same time, that an edition of Erasmus's "Paraphrase of the New Testament" was about to be published, he denounced the application to popular instruction, of either the Homilies or the Paraphrase. They contradicted each other, he observed; and they contradicted the articles of Henry VIII. The injunctions, moreover, could not supersede an act of parliament. Why this haste after all? Why disturb the country with controversy during the king's minority?

Cranmer endeavoured to defend himself with the remark, that Henry VIII. "was seduced" into many errors in his "King's Book." If it be so, resumed Gardiner, and if it be "necessary to obey God rather than man," I ought to suppose that your grace could not have consented to it. "And, therefore, after your grace hath, for years, continually lived in agreement of that doctrine, under our late sovereign lord, now so suddenly, after his death, to write to me that his highness was seduced,—it is, I assure you, a very strange speech." Such an act of inconsistency was not the only "strange" thing in the life of Cranmer. He was, during the first months of Edward's reign, busily engaged in preparing for great changes in religion. Amongst the other doctrines at which he was aiming his blows, was that of the sacrifice of the Mass. Yet, soon after the death of the king of France, the archbishop of Canterbury, assisted by eight bishops, "did sing a Mass of requiem," in St. Paul's Church (June 19, 1547).

Cranmer was not abashed by Gardiner's reply: he knew well the importance of gaining over so powerful an adversary; he, therefore, laid before him his homily on "Salvation." Gardiner replied, that he would yield to him in this homily, if he could show him any

old writer that wrote how faith excluded charity in the office of justification, and said that "it was against Scripture." Cranmer, after some discussion, lost his temper, and told him: "He liked nothing, unless he did it himself; and that he disliked the homily for that reason, because he was not a counsellor."

Unable to refute, the council determined to silence, so cogent an adversary. Gardiner was called before them, and required to promise obedience to the injunctions. He demurred, and in contempt of all law, was committed to the Fleet Prison.*

A general visitation, meantime, was in progress. The whole country had been mapped out into districts; and to each of these a mixed body of ecclesiastics and laymen was despatched in quality of royal visitors. They were commissioned to enforce the injunctions, and, at the same time, to excite a feeling against the Rosary and the Mass, as well as against all those minor external rites and ceremonies by which the Catholic Church nourished the devotion of its children.

Before this board, which had not the sanction even of parliament, the bishop and clergy of each diocese, together with the principal proprietors, were summoned, and were required to take the oaths of supremacy and allegiance, to furnish such information as the visitors thought proper to demand, and to promise obedience to the injunctions. Then followed the command, foreseen by Gardiner, for all the clergy to make use of the new Book of Homilies and of Erasmus's Paraphrase. Nor was this all: orders were speedily issued that these two works were to be the only instructions delivered from the pulpit. The manner in which preaching was suppressed is very

* Wilk. iv. pp. 2, 3, &c.; Cardwell's Doc. Annals, v. i. No. 1. Strype's Memor. of Cranm. book 2, chap. 3, and App. No. 35, p. 74; Strype's Memor. ii. c. 2, 5, and 7, p. 10, &c. 26, &c. See documents in Fox, p. 1339—1351; Stowe, p. 593, &c.; Herb. end of year 1539.

characteristic of the proceedings of this reign. About a week after Edward's accession, a royal proclamation declared, that persons, some curates and others laymen, "do rashly attempt, of their own and singular wit and mind," "to persuade people from their old and accustomed rites and ceremonies." To prevent confusion and disorder, the proclamation continued, no change was to be attempted, "unless by his majesty's visitors, injunctions, statutes, or proclamations." Then followed the real object of the proclamation: in order to check "rash and seditious preachers," whosoever shall take upon him to preach openly in any parish church, chapel, or any other open place, other than those which be licensed by the king's majesty, or his "highness's visitors, the archbishop of Canterbury or the bishop of the diocese," shall undergo imprisonment and further punishment, at the king's pleasure. The bishops were silenced, no less than the priests: no one was to preach without the license either of Somerset or Cranmer. No one (it was observed) that received such a license, was an advocate of the old doctrines: the country was resounding with authorized Calvinism.*

These preliminaries having been completed, the parliament at last assembled. The Mass, which it had always been customary to attend on such an occasion, was now for the first time sung in English (Nov. 4, 1547). A number of acts were then passed in rapid acquiescence with the wishes of Somerset. Communion was to be administered under both kinds. The *congé d'élire*, the last fragment of the old freedom of election, was dispensed with; and future bishops were to be appointed solely by royal letters patent. What need of any form of election, now that the entire au-

* Sir John Hayward's Edw. VI. Hayward was a Protestant. Wilk. iv. pp. 14, 17, &c.; Fox, p. 1297; Str. Mem. Edw. VI. Repos. O. p. 46. With regard to the restriction upon the preaching of bishops there may have been some doubt for three or four months; but in April, 1548, the bishops were expressly included in the prohibition. —Strype's Memor. book i. c. 12.

thority of the bishops was held to emanate from the Crown? All the new treasons and felonies, and all the punishments of heresy enacted by Richard II., Henry V., and Henry VIII., and amongst them, by name, the Statute of the Six Articles, were likewise abolished. Those chantries, guilds, and colleges which had escaped under Henry, were now to be suppressed. One of their principal objects, that of praying for the dead, was to give place, said the Act, to the foundation of grammar schools; a goodly portion, however, both of lands and moveables, being vested in the king.*

These enactments of Edward's first parliament were but a preparation for those of the second. Of these latter, the scheme of a new liturgy or service-book was the most toilsome, both in its preparation and promulgation. It was entitled the "Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments." It was compiled by a committee of eighteen bishops, and was taken chiefly from the Breviary and Missal. The preamble of the act enforcing it audaciously asserted that it was drawn up "by the aid of the Holy Ghost;" and yet, before the end of the reign, it underwent important alterations. It professed, moreover, to have been compiled with "one uniform agreement" of the commission of bishops, and yet no fewer than eight of the bishops voted against it in the House of Lords (Jan. 15, 1549).

Any clergyman that spoke against this new liturgy, or refused to make use of it, was to be punished, for the first offence, with the forfeiture of a year's income, and six months' imprisonment; for the second, with deprivation of all his "spiritual promotions," and a year's imprisonment; for the third, he was to be stripped of all his property, and incarcerated for life. If he had no kind of benefice, he was to be doomed to perpetual imprisonment for his second offence.

Those of the clergy (and they were but too many) that preferred the present life to the future, even

* See Appendix BB.

while so far conforming as to escape the law, were too much troubled in conscience to move a step in the cause without compulsion.

It required all the royal power and authority to eradicate Latin from the service, and to suppress the old rites of Sarum, Hereford, Lincoln, Bangor, and York. The paid itinerant preachers who, foreigners as many of them were, had been let loose upon the English, acting as spies upon both the clergy and the laity, wrote to the government frequent complaints. If the priests deigned to give the services in English, it was the Mass translated. If they were forced to go through the new service, it was often in such a manner that no one knew what was said or done. The laity, at the same time, would make no offering towards the new rite of what was called the Lord's Supper. These complaints produced royal visitations, rebukes, and edicts. In short, it was only by constant watchfulness that the new service could be held togegether, so little was it relished by the great majority of the people.*

No art, meantime, was left untried, which might win consent to the change, and to the accompanying acts of suppression. Amongst other means thus employed, was the diffusion of heterodox pamphlets. They were generally of a declamatory and scurrilous cast; witness those that appear in Strype's "Memorials," not excepting Thomas's instructions for the unfortunate little king. Amongst some from the pen of Cranmer himself, was a Latin treatise, written at the very beginning of the reign, against the traditions of the Catholic Church. Before many months had passed, it was translated into English under the title of "Unwritten Verities." It is scarcely deserving of notice, except for its statement, that amongst other traditions which the people had been taught to receive and love, were these two: "That our Lady was not born in

* Stat. of the Realm, 1, 2, & 3 Edw. VI.; Journ. of Lords, i. p. 331; Stowe, p. 595, &c. See also Strype's Memor. of Edw. VI. Repos. of Orig. passim.

original sin, and that she was assumed into heaven body and soul." *

Nothing, meantime, could reconcile the nation to this outrageous invasion of its religious liberties. A few violent acts were the first indications of the general indignation. Thus, in Cornwall, one of the royal commissioners was slain. The fact was avenged, rightly or not, in the blood of a priest, and several other persons. A few uneasy months passed, and then the slighted but just discontent, being increased by the inclosure of some of the commons, could no longer be controlled. The whole country shook with the repeated explosions of a general but unorganized revolt. Cornwall and Devonshire was the scene of the first outbreak; but, in a few weeks, there was scarcely a county in which there was not a violent commotion. Restore the Mass. Let us have the "old religion;" let the "Lord's Body" be retained in the churches; "let God's service be said or sung with an audible voice in the choir, and not forth like a Christmas play;" let "priests live chaste (as St. Paul did) without marriage;" let the Six Articles be restored; let there be in each county at least two abbeys.

Such was the general cry. It subsided in many places, "partly by the authority of gentlemen, partly by entreaty and advice of honest persons." Then again it arose more strongly than before; and the struggles around the walls of Exeter, and the repeated rallying of the insurgents, despite of their heavy losses and want of arms, told of the desperate resolution of the people of Devonshire. Martial law was executed without mercy upon the survivors; and what is altogether unjustifiable, "a great part of the country was abandoned to the spoil of the soldiers," without any distinction between the rebel and the faithful subject.

Still more serious, for a time, was the rising in Norfolk, under Robert Ket, the tanner of Wymondham (A.D. 1549). After much loss, this too was sup-

* See it in Strype, vol. ii. part ii. Repos. of Orig. AA. p. 97. See also, regarding the social causes of discontent, Appendix (antea).

pressed, and punished, by the earl of Warwick in person, and not without a breach of faith on the part of Warwick.

Somerset, having thus triumphed, not only over the people, but over his rivals, putting to death his own brother by a bill of attainder, was now engaged in completing the magnificent palace called Somerset House, little thinking that in a few weeks he was to be suddenly hurled from his high position, and that, after little more than two years, his own blood was to reek upon the scaffold like that of his murdered brother. Looking joyously into that unfathomed future, he was now intent upon his favourite building. To make room for it, he pulled down a church in the Strand, besides two bishops' houses; and in the very midst of the churchyard was not ashamed to lay the foundations of Somerset House. "In digging the foundations whereof," says Hayward, "the bones of many who had been there buried were cast up, and carried into the fields; and because the stones of those houses and the church did nothing suffice for his work, the steeple and most part of the church of St. John of Jerusalem, near Smithfield, most beautifully erected and adorned not long before by Docray, prior of that church, was mined and overthrown with powder." The cloister of St. Paul's, and the Dance of Death very curiously wrought about the cloister, and a chapel that stood in the midst of the churchyard; also the charnel-house, "with the chapel, tombs, and monuments therein, were beaten down, the bones of the dead carried to Finsbury fields, and the stones converted to his building."

To all this sacrilege there seems to have been no remonstrance. The Catholic bishops were in prison. The leading Protestants dared not rebuke: Cranmer was worldly-wise enough never to interfere with the "powers that be." *

* Hayward; Stowe, who says that not only private dwellings, such as the Protector's, but shops, were built with the materials thus sacrilegiously obtained. Also despatches in Strype's Mem.

The work of suppression, meantime, being no longer impeded by the indignant populace, was rapidly completed. Guilds, hospitals, and other charitable institutions for alleviating poverty or removing ignorance, were, by an iniquity unparalleled, wrested from the object of their founders, and from the public good, to be devoted, with few exceptions, to building up the fortunes of the invading courtiers, or to minister to their riotous excesses.

The colleges which were thus either wholly or in great part suppressed, were situated at Stoke, in Suffolk, Bury St. Edmund's, Leicester, Fotheringay, Shotesbroke, in Berkshire, besides Whittington's and Holmes's, in London, that of Penkridge, in Staffordshire, and others in various places. They were not necessarily places of education, but had different purposes, according to their founders' intentions, being chiefly established for the souls in purgatory. They seem to have derived their name from the body of priests who formed each college.

As the act which pretended to authorize this suppression enjoined that the proceeds should be applied to the foundation of grammar-schools, or other similar objects, about twenty free schools were established. Of these by far the best endowed was that at Nuneaton, having something more than forty pounds per annum. This endowment had been formed from two suppressed guilds belonging to that town. With what pleasurable feelings must the guildsmen have witnessed this cool abstraction of their money! The other endowments were each about twenty pounds per

ii. Repos. of Orig. DD. &c. These despatches evidently make as little as possible of the insurrection; but the facts, and even some admissions, are not to be gainsaid. Paget, writing from the Continent to the Protector, termed it a "dangerous tumult," and gives him some earnest advice, which shows how serious he thought was the crisis. In the same letter, Paget remarked, although himself one of the Reformers:—"The use of the old religion is forbidden by a law, and the use of the new is not yet printed: printed in the stomachs of eleven or twelve parts of the realm, what countenance soever men make outwardly to please them in whom they see the power resteth." Ib. HH. p. 110.

annum. The whole amount was, therefore, about four hundred pounds, while the annual income of even the imperfect list in Strype amounts to more than two thousand three hundred pounds. With regard to the other purposes mentioned in the act, nothing is recorded, because, indeed, nothing was done. The endowments, then, might partially conceal the real nature of the whole transaction, but the amount received and the amount disbursed tell how disinterested was the suppression, and from how real a love of genuine education arose the new endowments.*

Both the nature and the object of these transactions are thus briefly summed up by the Protestant historian Hayward: "Part of the goods and lands, being sold at a low value, enriched many, and ennobled some, and thereby made them firm in maintaining the change."

Scarcely three years had passed, when there was another, and a far more extensive, sale of chantry lands and houses. It was alleged to be "for payment of the king's debt; given forth to be two hundred and fifty-one thousand pounds, at the least." †

As if all this was not enough, the government commissioners were ordered to gather in another harvest. This was the closing act of spoliation under Edward VI. It is thus narrated by Stowe:—

"In this month of April, and in May (A.D. 1553), commissioners were directed through England, for all the church goods remaining in cathedral and parish churches, that is to say, jewels of gold and silver, crosses, candlesticks, censers, chalices, and all other such-like, with their ready money, to be delivered to the master of the king's jewels in the Tower of London; all copes and vestments of cloth of gold,

* Stowe, p. 604; Stat. of the Realm, 1 Edw. VI. c. 14. See list and value in Strype's Memor. Rep. of Orig. ZZZ. p. 85. See also various documents for the foundation of colleges in Dugd.'s Monast. passim. Strype's text would add several more to the above number; but if the list in his Repos. of Originals (I.) be examined, it will be found that some had no other grant than a license for purchasing land.

† Hayward.

cloth of tissue, and silver, to the master of the king's wardrobe in London; the other copes, vestments, and ornaments to be sold, and the money to be delivered to the king's treasurer, Sir Edmond Peckham, knight; reserving to every church one chalice or cup, with tablecloths for the communion-board, at the discretion of the commissioners, which were, for London, the lord mayor, the bishop, the lord chief justice, with other."

This account, from "Stowe's Chronicle," may be completed by Sir John Hayward. By these sales "the king's wants were somewhat relieved. And many persons very mean, both for birth and ability of mind, and of no less place of employment, found means to advance themselves to so great estate, as they left their posterity ranged among the nobility of the realm." *

* Stowe, p. 609; Sir John Hayward, an. 1552; Heylin, p. 134. Heylin lived in the beginning of the seventeenth century. He is, therefore, no direct authority; but, as chaplain of Laud, had many opportunities of acquiring information. His utility is still more diminished by his total want of references.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE TWO ARRESTS OF GARDINER AND BONNER—RIDLEY, ONE OF BONNER'S JUDGES, OCCUPIES HIS SEE—SEIZURE OF THE REVENUES—SUPPRESSION OF THE NEW SEE OF WESTMINSTER TO REPLACE THEM—INCARCERATION OF HEATH, THE BISHOP OF WORCESTER, AND DAY OF CHICHESTER — HOOPER THE NEW BISHOP OF WORCESTER'S INVECTIVES AGAINST THE SURPLICE, NEW ORDINAL, ETC.—IS PUT INTO THE FLEET PRISON, AND SUBMITS—THE NEW SEE OF GLOUCESTER "ADDED" TO THAT OF WORCESTER—GARDINER'S DEMAND FOR A TRIAL—HIS DEPRIVATION—THE REVENUES OF HIS SEE DIVIDED AMONGST THE FRIENDS OF THE COUNCIL—THE PAID PREACHERS—THEY ACT AS GOVERNMENT INFORMERS—SMITHFIELD FIRES—THE FORTY-TWO ARTICLES—THE NEW CANONS—UNEXPECTED DEATH OF EDWARD.

When these repeated acts of confiscation and change were as yet only in their commencement, those bishops that were most firm in the Catholic faith were either already in prison or were narrowly watched. Gardiner's imprisonment, already mentioned, terminated with the first session of parliament (Dec. 24, 1547). "On St. Peter's-day" following, however, having to preach before the king in approbation of the recent changes, he complied in so vague a fashion, told truths so unpalatable to the council, that merely for that "sermon he was, on the morrow after," says Stowe, "sent to the Tower" (June 30, 1548).*

Of all the English prelates, except Gardiner, Bonner was perhaps the most able and learned. He was the next to be seized. His arrest would remove an active opponent from the capital, and almost from the very precincts of Lambeth Palace; would open the way for the installation of one of Cranmer's own stamp; and would afford new spoils to the insatiable courtiers.

* See Articles 8, 9, and 10; and Gard.'s answers, in Fox, p. 1352, &c.

He had, indeed, like Gardiner, been already incarcerated; but although he must have understood the warning, he heeded it not. Still unsubdued in spirit, he neither introduced the new liturgy into St. Paul's, his cathedral, nor endeavoured to introduce it in any other part of his diocese. A letter in the king's name charged him to enforce the observance of the new service. He obeyed so far as to publish the king's letter, and the usual injunction that all should comply, but there was so little attempt to reduce it to practice that he was reprimanded by the council, and was ordered to read, from the pulpit at St. Paul's Cross, a sermon sketched out by the council. Struggling feebly for the old Catholic faith, and yet without having the rock of St. Peter under their feet, the poor bishops were obliged to lean upon their own prudence, presenting a sad, and yet, in some respects, a noble spectacle. Bonner submitted to read a discourse against which his conscience must have rebelled, but he took the opportunity to explain clearly the Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence. The written sermon itself was objectionable, from the doctrines of passive obedience in all cases, and of the sovereign's right to prescribe the forms of worship. All this, however, Bonner read; one point only did he omit—that which stated that the king's authority as a minor was as great as when he was of age. This, together with the explanation of the Real Presence, was enough.

Amongst those who were intently listening to his sermon, were two of the most conspicuous and busy of the paid and licensed preachers. These were Latimer, formerly bishop of Worcester, who had been set at liberty on the death of Henry, and Hooper, who had once been a Cistercian monk. They noted the omission of what regarded the king's minority, and informed the council; adding that, even on other points, he was not sufficiently precise. The omission touched its own unsparing exercise of royal authority; and perhaps even, as Ridley and Hooper had intimated with all due hesitation, might have been intended to encourage

the rebels, and therefore it commissioned Cranmer, Ridley, and several others, to examine the bishop (Sep. 10, 1549). They found it no easy task: Bonner objected to his accusers, as men of evil lives and notorious heretics. He objected likewise to the very commission by which his judges were appointed.

Being subjected to repeated examinations, and there checked and cross-questioned by a tribunal anything but impartial, it is little wonder if his natural energy, thus excited, bordered at times upon passion. Secretary Smith, as even Fox admits, "was somewhat more quick with him than others," "sometimes sharply rebuking him for his evil and stubborn behaviour." Bonner, therefore, on his fifth examination, presented a written protest against being tried by a judge so "uncompetent, unmeet, and suspect."

"My lord," replied Smith, "whereas you say in your recusation that I said, that you did like thieves, murderers, and traitors;—indeed I said it, and may and will so say again, since we perceive it by your doings."

"Well, sir," replied Bonner, "because you sit here by virtue of the king's commission, and for that ye be secretary to his majesty, and also one of his highness' council, I must and do honour and reverence you; but as you be but Sir Thomas Smith, and say as ye have said, that I do like thieves, murderers, and traitors, I say that ye lie upon me, and in that case I defy you: and do what ye can to me. I fear you not, and, therefore, *quid facis, fac citius.*"

Cranmer and the other commissioners interrupted this singular dialogue, by telling the bishop that his disrespectful words deserved imprisonment. Bonner replied, that they might send him where they pleased, and he would obey, "except ye send me to the devil, for there I will not go for you. Three things I have, to wit, a small portion of goods, a poor carcass, and my own soul. The two first ye may take (though unjustly) to you; but as for my soul, ye get it not."

"Well," said Smith, "ye shall know that there is a king."

"Yea, sir," answered Bonner, "but that is not you, neither, I am sure, will you take it upon you."

"No, sir," said the secretary, "but we will make you know who it is."

The bishop was then removed. He took the opportunity to encourage his clergy, assuring them that he was "right glad and joyful" to suffer that "trouble for God's sake." Having thus spoken, and having charged them to take measures to check heretical preaching, he was again taken into the presence of the commissioners, and having laid before them an appeal to the king, was again questioned. Having already fully replied, he said that he would give no further answer, unless compelled by the law. He was committed to the Marshalsea; and retired protesting against this treatment of a bishop, and still more against Cranmer's suffering heretics "to practice as they do in London and elsewhere."

Being again after this twice brought up, he protested against Cranmer and the whole commission, and declared that his appearance was compulsory, or he would not have heeded their summons.

Finding him resolute in his refusal to answer, Cranmer pronounced him deprived of his bishopric; the real cause of the sentence being, in Stowe's opinion, "for disobeying the king's order in religion" (Oct. 1, 1549).

Ridley, one of his judges, was put in possession of his see of London. This was done by letters patent, which pleaded the statute for putting aside the *congé d'élire*, and appointing any bishop to any see. The revenues of the see were divided amongst the Lord Chancellor Rich, the lord chamberlain, and the vice-chamberlain (April, 1550). Ridley, as some kind of equivalent, received the revenues of the see of Westminster, which was now suppressed. Westminster was one of the six bishoprics which Henry VIII. had established. It had had but one bishop, Thirlby. It

was much richer, it appears, than the other five, and yet, although the abbey revenues were three thousand nine hundred and seventy-seven pounds, the new see had but five hundred and twenty-seven pounds; and even of this sum, Ridley had to disburse one hundred pounds to the Crown.*

After Bonner's case had been disposed of, but before the see of London had been thus despoiled, Heath, the bishop of Worcester, was proceeded against. A new ordinal, or form of ordination, had been drawn up in virtue of an act of parliament (Nov. 1549).† This had been protested against by several bishops, amongst whom was Heath. He was called upon to subscribe to it; and his refusal being termed contempt, he was sent to the Fleet (March 4, 1550). Day, of Chichester, soon followed him, for resisting the substitution of plain communion-tables for jewelled and consecrated altars. After being some time in the Fleet, "they were both taken together to St. Paul's, and underwent the form of deprivation." The revenues of their sees became, in great measure, as well as altars in all directions and the ornaments of altars, the prey of time-serving dependents upon the government (March, 1551). Hooper was not forgotten in this partition. He had been one of the informers against Bonner, and was conspicuous for his invectives against not only the Church, but the surplice (all that was now left of the ancient vestments), the oath of obedience to Cranmer, the metropolitan, the new ordinal, and, at last, even the council itself. The Fleet Prison soon tamed his refractory spirit. On his making a full submission, as he had already been named bishop of Worcester in

* Thirlby had been one of the priests and head master of St. Thomas's Hospital in Southwark. By his prompt surrender to the Crown of the institution intrusted to him, he "made his way," says Burnet, to the new see of Westminster (Ref. i. p. 268).

† Fox, pp. 1303—1329; Stowe, pp. 597, 605; Speed, p. 1064, ed. 1632; Str. Mem. v. 2, b. i. chap. 25, p. 213, and chap. 27, p. 217. Strype ventures to assert that Ridley received a real equivalent. As he does not prove this, and in his text is exceedingly inaccurate, the testimony of contemporaries must of course be preferred.

Heath's place, he was allowed to take possession "during his good behaviour." The see of Gloucester, another of the creations of Henry VIII., was now annexed to that of Worcester, and the greater part of the united revenues was appropriated as usual.

During the proceedings against Bonner, Heath, and Day, the voice of Gardiner had made itself heard, even from his dungeon in the Tower. He claimed a fair trial: "I have," he wrote, "continued here in this miserable prison, now one year one quarter and one month this same day that I write these my letters, with want of ease to relieve my body, want of books to relieve my mind, want of good company, the only solace of this world; and, finally, want of a just cause why I should have come hither at all."*

This complaint excited a smile, and awakened some compassion, but remained unnoticed. He, therefore, wrote again, claiming his right to be present in the House of Lords, which was then assembled; and demanding, at least, a fair trial. When, at last, his reasonable demands had grown importunate, he was tried at Lambeth, by Cranmer and a board of royal commissioners. He seems to have perplexed his examiners, being taken eight times from the Tower to Lambeth. On one point he was still willing to prove himself the creature and apt scholar of Henry VIII., he subscribed once more to the royal supremacy: to refuse would have been death. Being then required to subscribe his approval of the Homilies, the Paraphrase, and the general seizure of church property, he declined; and persisting in his refusal, he underwent a form of deprivation, and was sent back to prison.† The lands and revenues of his bishopric were then divided into eight portions, of which one

* Stowe, p. 600; Strype's Mem. ii. c. 47. Mentioning the imprisonment of Gardiner, Bonner, Tunstall, and Heath, Sir John Hayward adds, that they were all "famous for learning and judgment." —(Edw. VI. A.D. 1547.) Vesey of Exeter, the founder of Sutton Coldfield, was either deprived or resigned.—(Heylin, p. 101.)

† Fox, pp. 1339—1359.

was given to the Crown, and the other seven to the friends of the government. Poynet of Rochester succeeded him in the see of Winchester, and received various rectories and other lands for his support. When the prosecutors and judges can thus appropriate even the spoils of bishoprics, either to themselves or their friends, we are saved the toil of examining closely into their motives.

Paid itinerary preachers, as well as resident lecturers, were, all this time, pouring out incessant vituperation and calumny upon the Church. Grindal, who in the reign of Elizabeth became bishop of Salisbury, was one of the number. Some, and indeed the most active, of those that were thus doing violence to the consciences of Englishmen, were foreigners. Knox, the Scottish Calvinist, for instance, was busy in the neighbourhood of Newcastle; whilst Martyr, Phagius, Bucer, and Immanuel Tremellius, and several others, were presiding over the theology and Hebrew of the two universities.*

Whilst they were thus preaching up the new liturgy and the new code of belief, talking freely of reason and the Bible, they took care to bind down the reason of other men in subjection to their own. Some, led away by this doctrine, made full use of its principle, read the Bible by the light of their private reason, but without discovering in it the new Calvinistic doctrines. If such persons dared to maintain their own views, the new preachers became informers, and the fetters and walls of a prison taught what sort of liberty of conscience the new preachers advocated. Nay, there was more than fine and imprisonment; for some there was the Smithfield fire. Thus perished the Unitarians, Joan Bocher and Van Parris, by sentence of Cranmer and his associates (A.D. 1550 and 1551).

Yet these men thought that they had not sufficiently tormented the conscience, and therefore prepared a

* Fox, p. 1296; Strype's Memor. book i. c. 25, p. 205; ii. c. 14, p. 355; c. 18, p. 387, &c.; Repository of Originals, MM. p. 126, &c.
† Stowe.

new creed and new punishments. As they scattered their seed, they found arising under their hands a harvest of intractably discordant sects. As they still toiled on in their unholy task, they found yet greater difficulties: they could not agree among themselves. The Catholics, moreover, were not always to be deterred by the threats of the law: many of them opposed the king's preachers to the face, and so assailed their novelties and inconsistencies as sometimes to reduce them to silence.

The council was therefore applied to, and the result was the appointment of a board of commissioners to compile a code of belief. It was accordingly drawn up in forty-two articles. These articles announced the belief in the Trinity and Incarnation, and in all that is taught in the Apostles', Nicene, and Athanasian Creeds. The article on original sin declared it to be a corruption of the nature of each descendant of Adam, a loss of original justice, and deserving damnation. That on free will declared, that without the preventing and co-operating grace of God, we can do nothing. That on grace declared, that whilst it enabled the evil will to change, it offered it no violence, so that there can be no excuse for sin. Thus far there was but little admixture of error with the truths taught by the Catholic faith. It was very different with several that followed on justification and predestination. The Church was defined to be the "visible body of the faithful:" "As the Church of Jerusalem, of Alexandria, have erred, so also," it was pretended, "has the Church of Rome erred, even in matters of faith." It was added that there were two sacraments, baptism and the Lord's supper, signs of the Christian profession, and a means of exciting our faith. The other errors taught by these articles may easily be surmised; such as those regarding the Mass, purgatory, the civil power, celibacy. The remaining articles were directed against some of the new doctrines, that were too outrageous even for Cranmer, Ridley, and Knox; such as the unlawfulness of war, and the

doctrine that all, even the wicked, will be saved (June 19, 1553).

These articles were to be followed by a new body of canon law. It was already sketched out by Cranmer, when the death of Edward VI. put a sudden termination to the work (July 6, 1553). Had it not been for that interposition of providence, the scourge of persecution would have been bloody indeed. To believe in transubstantiation or the supremacy of the Holy See, or to deny justification by faith alone, was to be considered heresy. All that might be convicted of such heresy and refused to recant, were to be given to the flames.*

Paget, who was himself a member of the council, had stated to Somerset, in July, 1549, that the new religion was "not yet printed in the stomachs of eleven or twelve parts of the realm." † Yet upon those eleven-twelfths of the nation, the new doctrines were to be forcibly engrafted, and that by the terror of the Smithfield fires. Such was the love of English freedom in Cranmer and his Calvinistic associates.

* Strype's Memor. of Cran. book ii. chap. 27. The Forty-two Articles were devised, says Strype, "for putting an end to contentions and disputes in matters of religion" (p. 272). His assertion is sustained by King Edward's Mandate (Wilk. iv. p. 79). Of the Articles, "the archbishop was the penner."—Str. 272. See also Wilk. iv. p. 73; and Cardwell's Doc. An. vol. i. xxvi. p. 95, &c.

† "Look well whether you have either law or religion at home, and I fear you shall find neither. The use of the old religion is forbidden by a law, and the use of the new is not yet printed: printed in the stomachs of eleven or twelve parts of the realm."—Paget to Somerset, ap. Strype, ii. Repository of Orig. HH. or 109, Oxford, 1832.

CHAPTER IX.

THE SUCCESSION — USURPATION OF LADY JANE GREY—MARY'S PROMPTITUDE AND SUCCESS—EXECUTION OF NORTHUMBERLAND AND SIR JOHN GATES—SPEECH OF THE LATTER ACKNOWLEDGING HIS EVIL USE OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES—THE TOWER PRISONERS —MARY'S FIRST PARLIAMENT—STATUTE OF TREASONS—POLE'S ADVICE—LAWS OF EDWARD VI. REGARDING RELIGION ABOLISHED —INTRIGUES OF FRANCE AGAINST THE QUEEN'S MARRIAGE— INSURRECTION OF SUFFOLK AND WYATT—THE HAUNTED WALL— EXECUTION OF CRANMER—POLE ARRIVES AS LEGATE—RETURN TO OBEDIENCE — A PROVINCIAL SYNOD — ITS CANONS UPON PREACHING, ORDINATIONS, SEMINARIES, ETC.

By the general law of succession, Mary was now the rightful claimant to the throne. An act of parliament, it is true, had declared her illegitimate.

If this statute could set aside the custom of succession based upon the hitherto recognized law and rule of lawful wedlock, then either that part of the general law of succession which had not been limited by parliament was to be adhered to, or the supposed will of Henry VIII., previously authorized by parliament, was to be the recognized rule of succession.

By the latter, Edward VI. had already reigned, and Mary was to be his heir, if he left no children. By the former, both Mary and Elizabeth would be put aside, and the crown would devolve upon Mary, the infant queen of Scots, who was granddaughter of the elder sister of Henry VIII.

The council had but one of two paths to choose, if it chose justly. It had, indeed, no choice whatever, if it had any regard for its recent oath; for at the accession of Edward it had solemnly sworn to observe to the letter the supposed will of Henry VIII.

The duke of Northumberland, formerly Viscount Lisle and earl of Warwick, who had supplanted and

overthrown his rival, Somerset, had joined his fellow-councillors in taking that oath; yet now he had other plans. In utter disregard of Henry's will, or, that being set aside, of the usual law of succession, he had procured a marriage between his son and the Lady Jane Grey, a granddaughter of the younger sister of Henry VIII.; and having concealed the death of Edward for two days, whilst he was maturing his plans, he then proclaimed the Lady Jane. The citizens listened without any sign of joy or approval. Some even ventured to express their disapprobation; and for this one young man had both his ears nailed to the pillory in Cheapside, "and clean cut off." *

Mary was, meantime, preparing to vindicate her rights. She caused herself to be proclaimed at Norwich, and then, with a handful of followers, she unfurled her banner, and bade her faithful subjects assemble in arms in its defence. She soon found that the sympathies and resources of the people were entirely hers. Being now at the head of a small fleet of six ships, and of an army of thirteen thousand men, she prepared to take the offensive, instead of awaiting an attack.

The partisans of the Lady Jane were less active: they were slowly collecting a military force, in order to surprise and seize Mary. Of this force it was at first intended that the duke of Suffolk should be the leader. Some of the council, however, being friendly to the cause of Mary, suggested that Northumberland,

* Grafton's Chron. pp. 532, ed. of 1809. This work, first printed in 1569, and dedicated to Sir William Cecil, is strongly biassed. Stowe; Hayw. Edw. VI.; Fox; Godwin's Mary. Godwin was a Protestant bishop of Hereford, living in the reigns of Elizabeth and James I. He is generally the undiscriminating copier of Fox. When Hume first published his History, Griffet, a French gentleman, published extracts from the correspondence of Noailles and Renart, the French and Spanish ambassadors in the time of Mary. He thus laid open many facts in a perfectly new light. Hume and others deserve, as Griffet has proved, some blame for their want of criticism; but the cause of the evil is generally the gross partiality of Fox, on whom the majority of writers from Godwin to Hume have based their principal statements.

who had quelled Jack Ket's revolt, must needs be the terror of the people of Norfolk, and therefore the best qualified for such an enterprise. Their object was to remove him from London. He reluctantly submitted to the more than half-suspected honour (July 13, 1553). As he passed through London, on this his last expedition, he remarked to Lord Grey, "The people press to see us, but not one saith, God speed us!" Arrived at St. Edmondsbury, in the very neighbourhood of Mary's camp and castle of Framlingham, he thought it prudent to await reinforcements; for the information which he received, both from the country and from London, was of a most startling character. In the country, multitudes were flocking to Mary's standard; and amongst them was a band of four thousand men, which Sir Edward Hastings had raised by Northumberland's own commission. In London, the division in the council, hitherto concealed, was now manifest. Some, and especially Cranmer and the other active promoters of the late changes, were still for Lady Jane. Their mouthpiece to the Londoners was Ridley, the usurper of Bonner's see, and a number of other Protestant preachers,* who now mounted the pulpit at St. Paul's Cross and various other places, to defend the claims of the Lady Jane, and to pour out strong invectives against the two princesses, Mary and Elizabeth. Others, however, and amongst them the marquis of Winchester and the earl of Pembroke, as well as the earl of Arundel, who had for several months been imprisoned by Northumberland, began to concert measures for the accession of Mary. The evident unanimity of the country speedily forced all to acquiesce, and thus "the Lady Mary was, by the nobility and others of the council remaining at London, proclaimed Queen," amidst

* "Nam concionatores quos bene multos Londini constituit Northumbrius, ut Mariæ causam impugnarent, nihil ne Londini quidem profecerunt. Imo ne Ridley æquis auribus auditus est," &c. —Godw. Rerum Anglic. Annales, lib. iii. p. 106; 1616. Godwin was born in 1561.

such an outburst of enthusiasm, as soon as the word Mary was heard, that all the rest of the proclamation was drowned in the shouts of the people.

Astounded at the tidings that continually reached him, Northumberland had no alternative but to proclaim Mary himself. He was prevented by his own followers from escaping, and was delivered to the earl of Arundel, by whom he was finally committed to the Tower. He was speedily followed thither by the marquis of Northampton and other persons, both civil and military, as well as by Ridley, Cranmer, Dr. Sandes, the vice-chancellor of Cambridge, who had preached at the university against Mary's succession, and by Latimer, and other open abettors of Northumberland's treason. The duke was soon after tried in Westminster Hall, found guilty, and beheaded. In his last moments, he expressed his sorrow for his disloyalty; extolled the queen's clemency, who might, he said, have put him to death at once for being taken "in the field in arms" against her; * and as he knelt down for the fatal stroke, called those around him to witness that he died in "the true Catholic faith." Then saying the Miserere, De Profundis, and other prayers, he laid his head upon the block, exclaiming, "I have deserved a thousand deaths;" and so passed to judgment (Aug. 22, 1553).

In company with Northumberland was executed Sir John Gates, the instigator, if the duke's accusation may be credited, of the entire plot against Mary's succession. Sir John's speech from the scaffold, as inserted in "Stowe's Chronicle," furnishes a striking commentary upon the current events of the day:— "My coming hither this day, good people, is to die, whereof, I assure you all, I am well worthy; for I have lived as viciously and wickedly all the days of my life as any man hath done in the world. I was the greatest reader of Scripture that might be of a

* Fox (p. 1407, ed. 1583) says that the duke thus expressed himself from a hope of pardon. But Fox produces no proof; and his own assertion is but a slender authority.

man of my degree, and a worse follower thereof not living: for I did not read to the intent to be edified thereby, nor to seek the glory of God; but contrariwise arrogantly, to be seditious, and to dispute thereof, and privately to interpret it after my own brain and affection. Wherefore, good people, I exhort you all to beware how, and after what sort, you come to read God's holy word, for it is not a trifle, or playing game, to deal with God's holy mysteries: stand not too much in your own conceits; for like as the bee of one flower doth gather honey, and the spider poison of the same, even so you, except you humbly submit yourselves to God, and charitably read the same to the intent to be edified thereby, it is to you as poison, and worse: and it were better for to let it alone." *

Having triumphed over Northumberland's schemes, Mary disbanded her army, and, entering London, passed in state through exulting crowds, until she arrived at the Tower (July 30, 1553). There a touching spectacle awaited her. A little band of supplicants were kneeling on the Tower-green, intreating for mercy, or rather for justice. Amongst them was the aged duke of Norfolk, who had seen his gallant son, the earl of Surrey, the warrior-poet, led to the block, and who had himself so narrowly escaped the same fate. By the side of this victim of Cranmer and the Seymours, was Edward Courtney, son of the marquis of Exeter, one whose youth, cramped by imprisonment, was as piteous a sight as Norfolk's grey hairs. He had been a captive nearly fifteen years, and that without the semblance of a crime. There, too, was the duchess of Somerset, whose lord was so recently beheaded; and Gardiner of Winchester, now the spokesman of the entire party.

Mary raised them, one after another, consoled them, and gave them their immediate discharge. Gardiner had laboured for the divorce of her mother, and might

* Stowe, end of Edw. VI.; Godwin's Mary; Fox; Graft. Chron.

have expected to be made an exception, but he was pardoned with the rest, and the next month was made lord chancellor. Bonner, Tunstall, Day, and Heath, were all speedily set at liberty, and reinstated in their bishoprics.*

Being anxious to re-establish the ancient faith, Mary proposed to her first parliament that everything regarding religion should return to its condition at her father's accession. Perceiving, however, some strong indications of opposition, she withdrew the bill for further consideration. A measure of the greatest consequence for freedom, whether ecclesiastical or secular, was meantime passed (Oct. 1553).

Indignant at the late unusual punishments for mere words and opinions, the queen wished that all the recent acts of treason should be abolished. It was, therefore, enacted that only those offences should be deemed treason, petty treason, or misprision of treason that were expressly mentioned in the act of 25 Edward III., and that all offences made felony, or made to fall within the statute of præmunire, since the accession of Henry VIII., should be repealed.†

Being still determined to do her utmost for removing the statutes against religion, Mary applied for advice, not only to the royal counsellors, but to her kinsman, Cardinal Pole, explaining to him at once her fears, her difficulties, and her determination. The sum of his reply was, that she should, in the first place, seek the aid of God by prayer and alms-deeds; and then, "casting away all fear of man," should act boldly, for the honour of that God who gave her the crown.‡

Before the cardinal's reply could reach her, Mary had introduced two measures, to which, as being less sweeping than her first proposal, she felt assured that there would be little or no opposition.

* Godwin, Grafton, Fox.

† Stat. 1 Mary, c. 1.

‡ Addenda to Strype's Mem. of Cran. No. iii. Oxford, 1812; and Pole's Epp. p. iv. No. 44.

Of these, one declared, that the sentence of divorce against Catherine had been forwarded by intrigues, intimidation, and bribery, and had been given at last by Cranmer against all equity and right; and that, therefore, the various statutes by which it was ratified should be considered null, and the marriage lawful and valid. The other measure was the repeal of all the acts of Edward VI. which enjoined the use of the Book of Common Prayer, the Ordinal, the marriage of the clergy: in short, it was the restoration of religion, in the eye of the law, to its condition at the time of Henry's death. Both measures passed without opposition.

The repeal of the act of supremacy, although urged by Pole, was deferred, Mary being as yet uncertain of the means, and the attention of the whole nation being engrossed by proposals for a match between Mary and Philip of Spain, the son of Charles V. This match, says Stowe, had received "the consent of the council and nobility," but the prospect of so close an alliance between England and Spain immediately alarmed the selfish policy of France. Its ambassador, Noailles, adopted the most unjustifiable means to thwart the project. England was just emerging from heresy and schism, and France, a Catholic state, did its utmost to fling it back into the abyss. No matter the cost, the danger of an hour was anyhow to be averted. When England was, indeed, cast back by Elizabeth into heresy and schism, wofully did France rue the the lesson which she herself had taught.

Noailles drew about him every factious element in the country, until the supporters of Lady Jane, nearly all of whom owed their lives to Mary's clemency, were induced to prepare for another insurrection. Intrigues, nightly conferences, promises of aid from France,—every means was adopted of arousing a rebellious spirit. Thus was effected what Godwin, the Protestant bishop of Hereford, traces out. The proposed match was made a pretence for publicly inveighing against the queen. The Spanish prince, said these

mendacious orators, was to rule the nation at his own absolute will, as if he had conquered it. They added, that Mary had promised to make no change, and had broken her promise; and they attacked the cruelty which had hurled the Lady Jane from a throne to a dungeon.

These, and the most atrocious calumnies against Philip, had for some time been circulated, when suddenly the nation resounded with the clang of arms. In the midland counties, in Kent, in London, it was almost simultaneously heard. Then, again, it died away. It was a rebellion as brief, as mad, and, except in Wyatt's onslaught upon London, as nerveless, as it was unexpected (Jan. 1554).*

It taught Mary, however, the soundness of Charles V.'s admonitions. Had she been less lenient towards Northumberland's abettors, the recent insurrection would, probably, have never existed. The duke of Suffolk, the father of the Lady Jane, had been previously pardoned; but having a second time taken up arms, he could expect no mercy (Feb. 1554). Of the various executions which followed, only one deserves commiseration: it is that of the Lady Jane herself. When she accepted the crown, it was by the advice of her parents; and yet, being sixteen, she was old enough to know her duty. Sentence had been pronounced against her; and, but for the folly of Suffolk, would never have been executed. But now Mary was told that if she wished for peace, she must allow

* Holingshed, vol. iv. p. 15, &c.; Stowe; Godw. pp. 113, 114, &c. Beccatelli's Life of Pole. Beccatelli was one of Pole's clergy and intimate friends. "More than marvel it was to see that day," says Holingshed, speaking of Wyatt's attack, "the invincible heart and constancy of the queen herself. Insomuch that when one or two noblemen, being her captains, came in all haste to tell her (though untruly) that her battles were yielded to Wyatt, she, nothing moved thereat, said it was their fond opinion that durst not come near to see the trial; saying further, that she herself would enter the field to try the truth of her quarrel, and to die with them that would serve her, rather than yield one jot to such a traitor as Wyatt was; and prepared herself accordingly."—(Hol. vol. iv. p. 20). Grafton is almost word for word the same, Holingshed probably copying him.

the law to have its course. She, therefore, assented. Thus perished the unfortunate Lady Jane, in the first place, through her own want of firmness, pardonable though it may have been; and in the second place, as Stowe justly says, "for fear of further troubles and stir for her title." Yet it may have been that where there was no real claim, there could have been no real danger. This is proved by the very feebleness of the late attempt. But Mary was a Tudor: one drop more of tenderness would have made her character perfect.

The princess Elizabeth was found to be implicated: she was proved to have been aware of the late plot, and to have known that there was an intention to offer her the crown. Yet she made no attempt to inform the government; and when the rising took place, and she was summoned to court, she found a flimsy pretext for remaining at home. She was committed to the Tower. Gardiner's interposition saved her. His representation, that although at heart a traitor, she had yet committed no external act, was, after some discussion, admitted, and Elizabeth was finally set free. It would have been well, if afterwards she herself had not only known what it was to have been a prisoner, but had applied to others the maxim to which she owed her own safety.

The revolt having been suppressed and punished, parliament joyfully assented to the Spanish match; and Philip was received with every manifestation of national welcome. To the very last, however, the French ambassador continued his intrigues with the reformers. One incident of a most public character, which was contrived by the latter, deserves to be mentioned. Extraordinary sounds, some inarticulate, and some distinctly condemning the Mass and the queen's marriage, were heard as if issuing from a wall in Aldersgate-street. Crowds assembled to listen; and amongst them some who were in the secret, and who began to declare that it was the Holy Ghost himself that spoke. When this had continued for several days, workmen came by order of the magistrates, and

were busily pulling down the wall, when a young woman crept out of it; and having confessed that she was paid for the imposition, she was most deservedly put in the pillory (July 15, 1554).*

Whilst seditious attempts were thus continually repeated, Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, three who had taken so conspicuous a part in the treason of Northumberland, were, at last, put to death, not indeed as traitors, although condemned for treason, but as heretics. The incidents of Cranmer's death were but too conformable to those of his consecration, and his general public career. As long as he had a hope of life, he made but little difficulty in subscribing to any confession of faith, however different from that of either the Calvinists or the Lutherans. He made no fewer than six recantations; and acknowledged at the stake that they were all insincere; all made "to save his life if it might be" (March 21, 1555).

With regard to the policy or justice of these terrible proceedings, let others decide. One thing is certain: sedition very frequently went hand in hand with the new doctrines. It was not the fanaticism of one or two, as is evident from the conduct of the preachers on the death of Edward VI.; from the repeated treasonable conferences with Noailles; from the revolt of Wyatt; from numerous petty attempts, one reformer becoming a counterfeit Edward VI., and another a counterfeit earl of Devonshire, whilst another had the hardihood to make an actual invasion; and, in fine, from the encouragement given to such attempts by many of those who had fled abroad.

Notwithstanding so many provocations, however, there were some who openly disapproved of such a means of checking heresy. A Spanish friar, Philip's confessor, delivered in the presence of both Philip and Mary, in 1554, an eloquent oration on the unchristian nature of such punishments. The "bishops ought not," he reminded them, "to put any one to death

* Stowe, Feb. an. reg. 1, and July, an. reg. 2; Griffet, xl. &c.

for conscience, but, on the contrary, rather to let them live and be converted."*

Some time before Cranmer's execution, Cardinal Pole was invited by royal envoys to enter England. His progress from Dover to Gravesend, was attended by more than eighteen hundred gentlemen on horseback. The royal barge in which he was thence conducted to the palace at Whitehall, displayed at its prow a silver cross reared aloft, the public ensign of his legatine powers. Multitudes crowded the banks as he passed; and great numbers of boats followed in his course to do him honour.

After a few days, "the parliament-house being at that present kept in the great chamber of the court of Whitehall," the cardinal entered, and, in the royal presence, was introduced to parliament by Gardiner, the chancellor (Nov. 28, 1554). Thanking the parliament for having restored him to the honours of which Henry VIII. had deprived him, Pole expressed his ardent desire that they would allow him, in return, to inscribe them as citizens of "the heavenly court," and to reinstate them in true Christian greatness, by their repealing the laws directed against the unity of the Church, and receiving, with a penitent but cheerful heart, the reconciliation which he had been empowered to grant. The uplifted hands and eyes of many of the noble audience, and the absorbing attention of all, told how deep was the effect of the discourse. The legate having withdrawn, Gardiner, deploring his own fall, urged the acceptance of the proffered reconciliation. This was, on the following day, agreed to. The next day, the festival of St. Andrew, the king, queen, and legate being seated under the same canopy, Gardiner expressed the grief of the parliament for the schism, and their desire to return to obedience to the Holy See. This declaration being made, and being then presented in the form of a petition to the king and queen, and being placed by them in the hands of the

* Fox, Stowe, and Godwin, passim; Strype's Memor. of Mary, c. 26; and his Mem. of Cran. 384. See Appendix C.

legate, the whole assembly rose and moved towards the legate, who rose to meet them, whilst the queen besought him to grant their petition. The cardinal, therefore, after an eloquent exhortation, solemly absolved those that were present, as well as the whole nation, "and restored them to the communion of the Church, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen." "Amen, amen," exclaimed the assembly, rising from its knees. Embracing one another with tears of joy, and repeatedly exclaiming, "To-day we are born again," they adjourned to the royal chapel, and sang the "Te Deum."

On the following Sunday, at the invitation of the lord mayor and aldermen, the legate made a public entry into the city; moving from St. Paul's Wharf to the cathedral, where High Mass was celebrated, the whole court being present. The sermon that followed at St. Paul's Cross, was preached by Gardiner, being a public lamentation over his own fall, and an invitation to those who had fallen with him, to return also with him to the "one fold" of the "one Shepherd." When the tidings arrived at Rome, the Holy See expressed the greatest joy in a public procession, at which the Pope and all the cardinals assisted; and in the grant of a plenary indulgence, in the form of a jubilee, to all those who, amongst other good works, should offer thanks to God for England's return to obedience.*

Various statutes having been passed, to adapt the law to the state of reconciliation, and the clergy having formally relinquished all their claims to confiscated property, and other rights, Pole granted permission to those who were in possession of church lands to retain them, and absolved them from excommunication, provided they presented themselves to a priest in confession; but, at the same time, he

* Grafton; Beccatelli's Life of Pole, Nos. 23—26; Wilk. iv. p. 111. See also a somewhat scurrilous, but occasionally interesting account of the "journeys" of the English ambassadors to Rome in Hardw. State Papers, i. pp. 97, 99, &c. (April, 1555.)

cautioned those that were in possession of the moveable goods of the Church, to bear in mind the punishment of Baltassar; and exhorted all who held lands once belonging to the Church, to devote some part to the support of the lesser parish churches, and of the general burdens entailed in the care of souls.

These and various other dispensations and arrangements were fully ratified by the Holy See.*

To apply a remedy to the many spiritual evils of the country, was the legate's next endeavour. A provincial synod was therefore summoned. It was not only followed, but in some cases was preceded, by a visitation. Amongst the articles of inquiry preparatory to Bonner's visitation, in September, 1554, besides the ordinary investigation into sound doctrine and the due administration of the parish, there was one in particular which, if duly enforced in the late reign, would have prevented great suffering and dangerous tumults. This was, "whether your parson or vicar by himself or his good and sufficient deputy for him, do relieve his poor parishioners." †

The general state of the country having been thus sufficiently ascertained, the expected synod was immediately held.

Some of its regulations so closely resemble what was soon after decreed by the Council of Trent, as to make Pole's English biographer think that the fathers must have modelled their decrees regarding seminaries and other points of discipline, upon those of Cardinal Pole. However this may be, it is certain that when Paul III. was meditating the renovation of ecclesiastical discipline, one of the first whom he invited for this purpose to Rome, was Reginald Pole; and it is probable that Pole himself, on the other hand, derived his ideas of much of the intended renovation from the Holy See, and from the bishops and theologians with whom he

* Stowe; Beccatelli, No. 29; Bull of Oct. 5, 1554; Tierney's Dodd, v. ii. App. Nos. 22 and 23; Str. Mem. iii. Cat. of Orig. No. 22.

† In Strype's Mem. vol. iii. Cat. of Orig. No. 16, p. 38.

afterwards laboured in the earlier sessions of the Council of Trent.

The operation of the præmunire statutes having been neutralized by a royal warrant, the synod met in the gorgeous chapel of Henry VII. in Westminster Abbey (Nov. 1554 to Nov. 1555). Its first object was to renew the ecclesiastical spirit. For this purpose it enjoined the study of Otto and Ottoboni's constitutions, forbade non-residence and pluralities, and was particularly urgent upon the duty, on the part of all who had the care of souls, of preaching, at least on Sundays and festivals. The bishops were enjoined to intrust this last-mentioned and important duty only to those whom they had carefully instructed; and the preachers themselves were to preach penance, and to warn their people of the errors and disorders with which the whole country abounded. Pastors were not only to preach publicly, but to visit privately, to arouse, console, or render whatever spiritual aid might be requisite. As duly-qualified preachers had grown scarce, homilies were to be drawn up by due authority, and to be distinctly read to the people by those who were unable to preach. These homilies treated of controversial points, of the Creed and Commandments, of the Lord's Prayer and angelical salutation, and the sacraments, of the Epistles and Gospels of the various Sundays and festivals, and of the virtues and vices, and rites and ceremonies. The catechising of children was likewise to take place in the church, on every Sunday and festival.

Moderation in dress, furniture, conversation, and food, was strongly impressed upon the clergy. Whatever was thus saved was to be devoted not to avarice, but to the education of youth, and other works of charity. Bishops were reminded of the Apostle's caution to Timothy: "Impose not hands lightly upon any man." They were to make certain of the goodness and learning of candidates for holy orders, if possible by personal scrutiny, and if not, by means of those on whose diligence they could thoroughly rely.

To remedy the scarcity of subjects fit for the care of souls, it was enjoined that every cathedral should, in proportion to its income, maintain a school of a certain number of boys. These boys were to be only such as gave indications of aptitude for the sacred ministry, had reached the years of at least eleven or twelve, were the children of poor rather than of rich parents, and had learned to read and write. They were all to wear the tonsure and the ecclesiastical dress, to live in community, and to assist in the cathedral offices. The more advanced were to receive holy orders, and to serve the Church at the discretion of the bishop and chapter. To this school other youth might be admitted, provided they had been sufficiently educated, behaved well, and conformed, in dress and every other way, to the regulations of the seminary. This school was to be under the superintendence of the dean and chapter. With regard to other schools, every schoolmaster, and the books to be used by him, were to be examined and approved by the ordinary. Every schoolmaster not complying with this statute was to be excommunicated, and to be excluded from teaching for three years.*

When the synod was over, and the bishops were preparing to execute its decrees in their various dioceses, Dr. Story and others were appointed by the cardinal to make a visitation of all parish churches in London and Middlesex, in order to see that the rood-lofts bearing the crucifix and the images of the Blessed Virgin and St. John were everywhere repaired (Nov. 1555).

It is, unfortunately, needless to trace the effects of the synod, whether in visitations or in the progress of order and learning: the premature death of Mary arrested progress, and the enactments of Elizabeth crushed religion, and set up in its place its empty resemblance, the Anglican establishment.

* Wilk. Conc. iv. p. 121, &c.; Beccatelli, Nos. 9 and 30, &c.; and Phillip's Life of Pole, vol. ii. p. 176, &c.

CHAPTER X.

THE SUCCESSION AND PROCLAMATION—THE ROYAL COUNCIL: ITS DOUBLE CHARACTER—THE PLANS OF THE NEW OR PROTESTANT PART OF THE COUNCIL—SIGNS OF ELIZABETH'S HETERODOXY—REFUSAL OF THE BISHOPS TO CROWN HER—OGLETHORP'S RASHNESS AND REPENTANCE—METHOD OF SECURING A PROTESTANT MAJORITY IN HER FIRST PARLIAMENT—THE SUCCESSION—ACTS OF SUPREMACY AND UNIFORMITY—UNANIMOUS OPPOSITION OF THE BISHOPS AND THE CONVOCATION OF THE CLERGY—DECLARATION OF THE LATTER—REMONSTRANCE OF VISCOUNT MONTAGU—THE PROTESTANTS ACKNOWLEDGE THEIR DEFEAT IN ARGUMENT IN THE PARLIAMENT—EXCITEMENT—CONFERENCE—DESTRUCTION OF CRUCIFIXES, IMAGES, ETC.—DEPRIVATION OF BISHOPS AND OF BENEFICED CLERGY—DESOLATE STATE OF THE UNIVERSITIES—PILLAGE OF CHURCH PROPERTY—PARKER, ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY—OBJECTION TO THE VALIDITY OF HIS CONSECRATION—BONNER AND HORNE—DECLARATION OF PARLIAMENT—THE VACANT CHURCHES: HOW FILLED—EXTERNAL CHANGES LIMITED, AND WHY—ELIZABETH'S UNSUCCESSFUL EFFORTS TO REDUCE ALL TO HER OWN UNIFORMITY.

THE parliament was sitting when news of Mary's death was brought to the Lords. A deep silence followed the announcement.

If we are to believe Camden, it was not the silence of conventional forms, but of earnest grief.* Recovering from the first shock, and consoling one another, they now turned their attention to the succession. By one statute of Henry VIII., Elizabeth had been declared, in the event of Mary's dying without issue, to be her legitimate successor. A subsequent law, it is true, had excluded her, and had, therefore, virtually abrogated the former, by

* "Ex præcipuo quodam dolore aliquantisper obmutescunt."—(Camd. Eliz. an. 1558.) Camden wrote his "Annals of English and Irish Affairs under Elizabeth," at the request, as he himself tells us in his preface, of William Cecil, Lord Burghley. He sees the events which he describes, with the eyes of his patron.

declaring Henry's marriage with Anne Boleyn null from the beginning. This subsequent law was still upon the statute book; but Elizabeth's title was, nevertheless, unanimously recognized. The Commons were then summoned; and Nicholas Heath, the archbishop of York, and chancellor of the kingdom, announced to them the death of Mary, declared that the right of Elizabeth was unquestionable, and stated the determination of the Lords to proclaim her, provided the Commons assented.

The archbishop's speech was received with the cry of "Long live Queen Elizabeth;" and at once Elizabeth was proclaimed with the usual forms, at Westminster and Temple Bar, as queen of England, France, and Ireland, and Defender of the Faith.* (Nov. 17, 1558).

Elizabeth was now in the twenty-sixth year of her age. Both Camden and Hayward paint her character in glowing colours. There is no doubt that, like Mary, Elizabeth had qualities that fitted her for command. She had decision, vigour of mind, insight into the motives of men, and that free and condescending, though often assumed, gaiety that immediately wins the affections of the thoughtless crowd. The sterner and darker features of her character had not yet disclosed themselves.†

* A writer of the following century thus states the objection felt by many to Elizabeth's assuming the crown:—"Since the whole kingdom had crowned and sworn allegiance to Queen Mary, they had owned her legitimate daughter to Henry VIII.; and therefore it was thought necessarily to follow by many, that if Mary was the true child, Elizabeth was the natural, which must then needs give way to the thrice noble queen of Scots."—Lord Castlemain's Apology, apud But. Hist. Mem. vol. iv. p. 173.

† Camd. Rerum Anglic. et Hib. regnante Eliz. an. 1558, ed. 1639. Camden and Hayward were scarcely contemporaries of the beginning of Elizabeth, being born about that time, or a little earlier. They were, says Bruce, the editor of Hayward's Annals, joint historiographers of King James's College at Chelsea. Hayward's Annals extend no farther than the first four years of Elizabeth. It requires but a slight perusal of his works to discover his lack of judgment, his pedantry, and his egregious flattery. In his Edward VI. he is brief upon the changes of religion, but can afford to give long dissertations

The new queen retained, at first, the thirteen counsellors of Mary, who were all Catholics. It could not escape notice, however, that seven additional persons to whom she gave a seat in her council, were men who were then actually Protestants, or had been such under Edward VI. These were William Cecil; Francis Russel, earl of Bedford; William Parr, marquis of Northampton; Thomas Parr; Edward Rogers; Ambrose Cave, and Francis Knowles. William Cecil, afterwards Lord Burghley, had, in the reign of Edward VI., procured an honourable post in the household of Somerset, the Protector, and soon became secretary of state. He professed himself a Catholic under Mary, and a Protestant, again, under Elizabeth; and, even in Mary's time, finding himself little noticed, had devoted all his energies to Elizabeth. Francis Russel was made earl of Bedford by the government of Edward VI. His wide lands were the spoils, for the most part, of religious houses and hospitals; his principal seat being the suppressed abbey of Woburn. William Parr, the marquis of Northampton, had acquired this title immediately after the accession of Edward VI., and for high treason against Mary had lost it, and now again recovered it. To these seven councillors, was soon added Nicholas Bacon, another Protestant, who was appointed to be the lord keeper of the great seal, in place of Archbishop Heath. The queen had required the archbishop and others to take the oath of supremacy, exacted by her father. His refusal was the pretext for transferring his office to Sir Nicholas.

upon trifles. He cannot, for instance, mention Edward's being brought into the world by the knife, without a long account of those (Æsculapius and Julius Cæsar included) who came into the world in a similar manner. His description of Elizabeth's person and character is a curiosity: one passage may be quoted as characteristic of the age. "Her virtues were such as might make an Ethiopian beautiful. In life she was most innocent; in desires, moderate; in purpose, just. Excellent queen, what do my words but wrong thy worth? what do I but gild gold? what but show the sun with a candle, in attempting to praise thee, whose honour doth fly over the whole world upon the two wings of magnanimity and justice."—Annals (printed by the Camd. Society), pp. 7 and 8.

Another bishop, a few days before Heath's resignation, received a still more striking mark of Elizabeth's displeasure. The funeral of Mary was celebrated according to the Catholic ritual. White, the bishop of Winchester, who preached on the occasion, uttered something which gave offence to Elizabeth. There seems, however, to have been nothing in the sermon disrespectful towards her; and if the law, on such an occasion, were at all applicable, there was nothing against the law. No matter; it had offended Elizabeth, and, therefore, both the personal liberty of the subject and the episcopal character must be alike despised: the bishop was ordered to remain shut up in his own house; and, after a month's confinement, was summoned before the council, to receive a stern reprimand. A passage from the obnoxious sermon, quoted by Strype, is probably that which gave offence. It is a caution to the flock to beware of wolves.

"If they who by God are placed to keep watch and ward upon the walls, and give warning when the enemy cometh, see the wolf come toward the flock, as at this present, I warn you, the wolves be coming out of Geneva, and other places of Germany, and have sent their books before, full of pestilent doctrines, blasphemy, and heresy, to infect the people; if the bishops, I say, and ministers in this case should not give warning, neither withstand and resist, but, for fear or flattery with the world, forsake their places, and thereby give occasion to the wolves to enter and devour the flock, then should the more mighty be more mightily scourged, and the blood of the people be required at their hands."*

From Elizabeth's choice of ministers, and from her treatment of the two bishops, men began to divine her future policy. In her own mind, that policy was already clearly marked out. It was not to be the growth of circumstances. It was not to be modified by the wishes or necessities of her people. They were

* Strype's Ann. of Eliz. Introd. p. 34, and c. 7, p. 104.

to change, and to change many of them against their very conscience. She herself was alone to be inflexible. "Semper eadem" was her motto. She was about to establish Protestantism, not only as the state religion, but as that before which, at his peril, every one of her subjects must bend his knee.*

Whether it was from any such plan, or merely from political reasons, she caused the ports to be closely guarded, so that no one without license or notice might enter or depart the kingdom. She, in like manner, forbade, for a time, all exchanges, and, especially, all exportation of money; and, what was significant enough, that all persons "forbear to preach or teach or to give audience to any manner of doctrine or preaching other than to the Gospels and Epistles, and to the ten commandments in the vulgar tongue, without exposition or addition of any manner, sense, or meaning, to be applied or added" (Dec. 27, 1558). The wording of the proclamation implied great impartiality; but the fact proved the reverse: it soon appeared that those only were to preach, who had the queen's license. The Catholic clergy, however, knew their duty too well to heed the royal prohibition. As many, therefore, continued to feed their people with the word of God, some were made an example of. A canon of Lichfield, and two curates of Canterbury were, amongst others, put under arrest. This was done, too, by a despotic use of royal proclamations, which were not enforcing any law, and were, therefore, pointedly opposed to the Magna Charta.† Nicholas Harpsfeld, the archdeacon of Canterbury, on a similar charge, which was termed sedition, he having said that "religion could not, nor should not, be so altered," was summoned before the council. Another priest,

* "Primis auspiciis primam curam, sed cum pauculis intimis adhibet de Protestantium religione restauranda.....et restaurare quidem certa et stabili sententia apud animum statuerat."—Camd.

† Stowe; Camd. Annals, p. 5, and Camd. an. 1598; and compare Camd., Hayward, and Stowe, an. 1558 and 1559; and Strype's Eliz. Introd. &c. and chap. i. p. 43, &c.; Strype's Eliz. Appendix, Nos. 2, 3, and 4.

Sir Peter Walker, of Colchester, was, upon an equally vague accusation, ordered by the council to be put in the pillory.

While these events were in progress in England, the ambassadors both of England and of foreign powers were busily, but, as much as possible, secretly, engaged in endeavouring to profit by the change of circumstances. Philip, anxious to retain England's alliance, offered his hand to Elizabeth, pledging himself to obtain a dispensation from Rome. Henry II. of France, as if he had divined Philip's intention, was busy at Rome, keeping before the eyes of the cardinals Elizabeth's Protestant tendencies and illegitimate birth. Elizabeth herself, although hesitating with regard to Philip's proposals, was secretly treating with the Protestant chiefs in Germany and the North.

Her hesitation, if indeed it were sincere, was speedily at an end. Her councillors reminded her that two popes had declared the marriage of Henry with her mother unlawful; that if by appealing to him in the present or any other case she were to acknowledge his authority, she would destroy her own hopes and those of her friends; since Mary of Scotland, who had announced her own claim to the throne, would assume it, by virtue of the pontifical sentence already promulgated.

To one who was not weighing the conflicting rights of herself and her Scottish cousin, but only considering how to secure what she already possessed, this view of her position must have been both startling and decisive. She scarcely paused until they dilated fully upon what they termed the injustice of Rome to herself and her mother. She declared that she was resolved; that the only question now was, how and when the Protestant religion could be re-established.*

* "Quomodo Protestantium religio, Pontificia profligata, restabiliretur," &c.—(Camd. an. 1558, p. 6, Amsterdam, 1639.) Where the word *Protestant* is applied in this reign to the Church of England, it is copied direct, in many cases, from Camden and Hayward, themselves of the Church of England.

These questions and their solution were all written down in a deliberate scheme of operations, which is still extant. Of this scheme, the first point was, the time for the change. The answer was, that it should begin the very next parliament. The second point regarded the dangers that were to be anticipated. The Pope would "excommunicate the queen's highness, interdict the realm, and give it as a prey to all princes that will enter upon it." France, Scotland, and Ireland will probably be troublesome; as well as the English bishops and clergy and others. The third point was, a "remedy for these matters." This was, to make peace with France and Scotland; and "if controversy of religion be there among them, to help to kindle it;" to strike down and "discredit" those that were of Queen Mary's council; and to force the clergy by parliament, by the "præmunire and other such penal laws," to "put themselves wholly at her highness' mercy, abjure the Pope of Rome, and conform themselves to the new alteration; and by this means, well handled," it was added, "her majesty's necessity of money may be somewhat relieved"! As a further remedy, the sheriffs and judges were to be displaced; "a short law made and executed against assemblies of people without authority. Lieutenants made in every shire; one or two men known to be sure at the queen's devotion." The fourth point was, "the manner of doing it." For this purpose, some "learned men" were to be consulted; and "being approved of by her majesty, may be so put into the parliament-house; to the which, for the time, it is thought that these are apt men: Dr. Bill, Dr. Parker, Dr. May, Dr. Cox, Mr. Whitehead, Mr. Grindal, Mr. Pilkington. And Sir Thomas Smith to call them together, and be amongst them. And after the consultation with these, to draw in other apt men for that purpose and credit."

The men who were to be thus chosen for parliament, or rather thrust into it, were most of them the exiled preachers, who had now returned from Geneva

or Strasburg, to bring back into England the dissensions which they had continued even in banishment. To some of them, being open Calvinists, was intrusted, at the same time, the revisal of the Book of Common Prayer.* Mitres and benefices were their compensation.

When the entire plan was maturely discussed and finally arranged, it was decided that it should be at once put in practice; that no additional change should be on any account permitted, lest the people should contemn authority; and that it should be kept a profound secret from the whole council, excepting only the marquis of Northampton, the earl of Bedford, the earl of Pembroke, and the lord John Grey. There can be no doubt that Cecil himself was the compiler of this document.

Of this written plan the bishops of course were ignorant; but of some such intention they had well-grounded suspicions. The tender of the oath of supremacy to Heath and others; the punishment of the bishop of Winchester for his sermon at the funeral of Mary; and, still more, a prohibition to the bishop of Carlisle to elevate the Blessed Sacrament in the mass, pointed out but too plainly the future career of Elizabeth. Under these circumstances, what were the bishops to do? Could they administer the usual coronation oath, by which Elizabeth would have to swear not only to reign justly over her people, but to defend the Church? Such an oath, they perceived, she did not intend to keep. Could they celebrate the usual coronation high mass? or, in that mass, administer to Elizabeth the Holy Communion, as if she were a Catholic? It was plain that, with a safe conscience, they could not. They therefore resolved that they would not. As the see of Canterbury was vacant by the death of Cardinal Pole, who died immediately after Queen Mary, it devolved upon Heath, the arch-

* Append. to Strype's An. El. No. 4. It is a copy of one of the Cotton MSS. See also Stowe; Hayw. p. 5; and Camd. p. 7, &c. See Appendix D.

bishop of York, to be the officiating bishop at the coronation. He was therefore requested by the government to perform the usual coronation service. He remained firm to his resolution; other bishops were equally constant. One, however, Oglethorp, the bishop of Carlisle, was at last weak enough to abandon his purpose; and even to invade what he knew to be the prerogative of another.* No opposition of the kind having been attempted, the coronation service was performed, and in the eye of the people the queenly power was ratified (Jan. 14, 1559). When Oglethorp afterwards saw Elizabeth's hostility to the Church, in direct violation of her coronation oath, he saw clearly the rashness and presumption of which he himself had been guilty, and his grief, we are told, cut short his days.†

The coronation was speedily followed by the opening of parliament (Jan. 1559). The elections were in great measure dictated by the court. Lists of candidates were sent to the sheriffs, who had themselves been just appointed by the queen, and who were now cautioned to take care that none should be chosen for parliament that were not upon the lists. By thus trampling upon the old statutes of freedom of election, a majority of Protestant members was secured. The elevation of five Protestants to the peerage, and the absence, from death or sickness, or in the course of the session from incarceration, of more than half the bishops, promised the Reformers a decisive advantage even in the House of Lords.†

* Stowe, Bridgw., Allen's Ans. to Eng. Justice.

† Allen's Respons. ad Persec. ap. Concert. p. 317, &c.; Stowe.

‡ Strype's An. El. Introd. p. 33. Hayward thus obscurely refers to the packing of the two houses:—"After this the parliament proceeded.....And now the Catholic party was much weakened, partly by the restraint of some bishops, mentioned before, and by the death of other, which was a main maim to that side, and partly by suspending of certain great officers from the execution of their places, for qualification whereof a proclamation was published that there was no meaning to displace them, but only to examine their abuses, whereof some should be judged in the parliament, other reserved to inferior courts, and some very like to be pardoned. But on the Pro-

The opening of parliament was marked by a sermon preached by no other than Cox, a Calvinist, who had been tutor of King Edward VI. (Jan. 25, 1559). In the subsequent preliminaries, it was observed, that whilst the queen forbade the use of all such "opprobrious words, as heretic, schismatic, or papist," invectives against the ministers and measures of the late reign were unsparingly uttered: the object evidently being to spur on the Protestants and discourage the Catholics.*

Amongst other matters introduced into parliament, was a declaration of Elizabeth's right. Henry VIII. had by one of his laws excluded both his daughters. This law Mary had cancelled as far as regarded herself. As far as regarded Elizabeth, it still remained upon the statute-book, declaring her mother's marriage with Henry null from the beginning. To remove this legal stain, it would be necessary to invite discussion. Yet such a discussion might be dangerous.† To escape the difficulty, the advice of the new chancellor, Bacon, was adopted: the law was allowed to remain as if unnoticed, and another was enacted, declaring that Elizabeth was, and ought to be, by the laws both of God and of this realm, the "most rightful and lawful sovereign queen of England, lineally and lawfully descended of the blood royal," according to the arrangement of the succession enacted in parliament in the thirty-fifth year of Henry VIII.‡

Measures far more important than earthly crowns had meantime been introduced, and were engrossing the breathless attention, not only of parliament, but of the entire nation. These were the two acts of royal supremacy and of uniformity of worship. The former statute enacted, that whatever jurisdictions, privileges, "pre-eminences, spiritual and ecclesiastical," had been

testant's party the assembly was made strong, as well by the election of knights and burgesses, as by creating certain barons whose devotion was that way settled" (p. 24).

* Hayw. pp. 19, 25, 26; Stowe; D'Ewes's Jour. 12.

† "Ulcus vetustate obductum refricare noluit."—Camd. an. 1559, p. 10.

‡ 1 Eliz. c. 3.

formerly in use, "by any spiritual or ecclesiastical power or authority" whatever, to visit ecclesiastics and correct every kind of error, heresy, schisms, abuses, and enormities, should be annexed for ever to the imperial crown of England; and that by letters patent, the queen and her successors might delegate certain men to exercise that authority, "by virtue of this act and of the said letters patents;" on this condition, however, that they should not define anything to be heresy but that which "has now already, by the authority of the canonical scriptures, or the four first general councils, or by other councils, from the true and genuine sense of the sacred writings, been defined to be heresy, or that which shall henceforth be defined by authority of parliament, with the assent of the clergy in convocation." *

Thus the full power exercised by any ecclesiastical authority, however high, for visitation and correction, was declared to be annexed to the crown. By whom? by this parliament. For what kind of correction? for anything that might be considered abuse, error, or enormity. A clause, it is true, limited the application of the term heresy with its severe legal penalties; but this limitation was too vague to fetter either a despotic sovereign or a keen-sighted lawyer. Who does not see the vast amount of legal power thus conferred? The crown was already growing absolute; but now the constitutional balance, ill adjusted for many years past, was at once destroyed. Still worse, what had been the characteristic mark of the Catholicity of the nation for a thousand years; its obedience and appeals to the Holy See, its constant communication with Rome, in matters ecclesiastical, for jurisdiction of bishops, for privileges, for visitations and correction, was now to be interdicted and usurped by the pretended authority of parliament. The old religion of the land was again, as under Henry VIII., to be violently changed in its essential characteristic; and,

* Journ. of the Comm. Nov. 17, 1558; stat. 1 Eliz. c. 1; Cam. pp. 10, 11.

moreover, an oath of allegiance to the new code of belief and worship was henceforth to be extorted.

For, in the above statute, it was added, that "every ecclesiastic and magistrate, persons receiving pensions from the treasury, or to be advanced to academical honours, wards attaining their majority and about to be admitted to receive the investiture of their lands, and to be enrolled amongst the queen's servants, and every ecclesiastical person and officer, as well as every temporal judge, officer, and minister, were to be bound by oath to acknowledge her royal majesty to be sole and supreme governor of her realms, as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes as temporal." Those that refused to take the oath were to forfeit their office. Those who by writing or preaching defended "the power or jurisdiction, spiritual or ecclesiastical," of what the statute termed "any foreign prince, prelate, person, state, or potentate," were doomed to forfeiture of all their property and benefices, if they had any; and if not worth twenty pounds, were to suffer a year's imprisonment. For a second offence all such persons were to suffer the penalties of a præmunire; and a third offence was declared to be high treason.*

When the bill of supremacy was safe, although not yet fully enacted, a bill of uniformity was introduced. The one book, entitled "The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonials," in the Church of England, authorized by an act of uniformity in the fifth and sixth of Edward VI., was to be "in full force and effect, with very few alterations," and to be everywhere used. Ministers refusing to use it were, for the first offence, to forfeit one year's income, and to be imprisoned for

* Camd. p. 11; stat. 1 Eliz. c. 1; Journ. of the Comm. Why the term "supreme head," used by Henry VIII. and Edward VI., should now be discarded, although the new term, "sole and supreme ruler," "as well spiritual and ecclesiastical as temporal," was virtually the same, is explained by Allen (Reply, p. 294). The old title had been attacked by Calvin, and was now kept out of sight as a concession to his adherents.

six months; for a second, were to be deprived, and to be imprisoned for twelve months; and for a third, were doomed to perpetual imprisonment, as well as a new deprivation. To use any words in derogation of the same book, was made liable, for a first offence, to the penalty of a hundred marks; for a second, to one of four hundred; and for a third, to forfeiture and perpetual imprisonment.

As if these violent measures were not enough, people were to be forced to attend the services thus schismatically changed, by spiritual censures (which still retained their external forms), and by a fine of one shilling for every case of absence on Sunday's and holydays.

One of the circumstances attending the enactment of this ecclesiastical revolution, deserves especial notice. In the change made by Henry VIII., the convocation of bishops and clergy was first tampered with. Not until they had admitted that Henry was "head of the Church as far as the law of Christ allows," did he venture to introduce the bill of supremacy to the notice of parliament. The bishops had always been recognized as that body of the English Church from whom emanated all definitions of doctrine. Their definitions, as the facts of history everywhere show, had, indeed, to be sanctioned by Rome; but from them it was that such definitions immediately came, when published to their respective dioceses. That they were not called upon now, is one of the most signal marks of change: the waters of doctrine no longer flowed from their ancient source.

Not only were the bishops not called upon, not consulted in the change; the change was made despite of them. The opposition of the nine bishops who were present when the bill of supremacy was introduced, was open, unhesitating, uncompromising.*

* Camd. 1559; Stat. 1 Eliz. c. 4; Pitsæus, "John Feenam, 1585;" Strype's Ann. El. c. 3. Strype's Append. (Nos. 6, 7, 10, and 11) contains several of these able speeches.

"Novem qui eo die aderant episcopi (nec plures quam quatuor-

They laid down in solid arguments, from reason, Holy Scriptures, and the fathers, the nature and prerogatives of the Church, especially in its visible head on earth, St. Peter and his successors.

The convocation of the clergy unanimously supported the bishops. They drew up a declaration to be presented to the House of Lords, in which they stated, that as many dogmas, taught by the Apostles and received by all Christian nations, were said to be now called in doubt, they had drawn it up for the discharge of their duty to the souls committed to their charge. It explicitly defined that in the Holy Eucharist, by virtue of the words of Christ pronounced by the priest, is really present the natural body of Christ, which was conceived of the Virgin Mary, as well as his natural blood; that after the consecration, the substance of the bread and wine is no longer there, but the substance of him who is God and man; that the mass is the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ, and is propitiatory for the living and the dead; that the power of defining matters of faith and discipline, and the administration of the sacraments, belongs only to the pastors of the Church. Of the temporal peers, only two distinguished themselves by their resolute opposition to the Bill of Supremacy. These were the earl of Shrewsbury and Antony Brown, Viscount Montague. The viscount had been one of the ambassadors to the Holy See on occasion of the late reconciliation of England with the Catholic Church. He now protested, in the name of honour itself, against another defection. In the name of the English parliament, in the name of all England, he had proffered obedience to the Pope. That obedience, then, could not, and ought not, to be withdrawn; it would be a

decim in vivis jam supererant) Eboracensis scilicet archiepiscopus, Londinensis, Wintoniensis, Wigorniensis, Llandavensis, Coventrensis, Exoniensis, Cestrensis, et Carliolensis, Abbasque Westmonasteriensis obfirmate refragati sunt."—(Camd. p. 11.) The bishops of Chichester and Rochester had died just after Elizabeth's accession.—Strype, An. El.

disgrace to the country. They were, moreover, indebted to Rome for the first conversion of their country to the faith, and they were indebted to Rome for its constant preservation: how, then, could they thus secede?

Against the Bill of Uniformity, eight other peers, besides Viscount Montague and the bishops, made their formal protest.

In the Lower House, the opposition of the Catholics was more easily overborne; not, however, until they had made an indignant remonstrance against the return of many Protestants, by the tampering of Norfolk, Arundel, and Cecil, with the recent elections.*

The Protestants, in the course of the various debates, had endeavoured to justify their separation, by pointing to that of the Greek Church. They were answered, that the Greek Church had remained for eight hundred years together in obedience to Rome; and had, moreover, repeatedly returned to obedience. The weight of argument, in short, was so strongly on the side of the bishops, that even the Protestants, in their private correspondence, acknowledged that, in parliament, their own supporters scarcely dared to "open their mouths." For this, however, they consoled themselves by what they themselves called "thundering" in their pulpits, especially in the queen's presence; and by denouncing the Pope to be antichrist, and "traditions, for the most part, mere blasphemies." †

* Camd.; Wilk. iv. 179; D'Ewes, passim. The names of those that protested against the Bill of Uniformity were the marquis of Winchester, the earl of Shrewsbury, Viscount Montague, and barons Morley, Stafford, Dudley, Wharton, Rich, and North.—(D'Ewes's Journ. p. 28.) The bill for the royal supremacy was "tossed about," says Strype, "in both houses, and many alterations made and many provisoes added."—Ann. El. c. 2, p. 58.

† Cox to Wolfgang Weidner at Worms, May 20th, 1559, ap. Str. Ann. Eliz. App. No. 21.

"Restiterunt in summo nostro concilio, quod parlamentum Gallico vocabulo appellamus, pontifices, scribæ et pharisæi. Et, quia eo loci paucos habebant, qui contra vel hiscere possent, vincere perpetuo videbantur. Interim nos, pusillus grex, qui apud vos in Germania

Considering these efforts, as well as those of the Catholics to defeat them, and the prolonged debates in parliament, it is no wonder that a vehement agitation began to pervade the minds of all classes: indignation, or triumph, or debate, was resounding on every side, when another royal proclamation was announced, the only effect of which was to give fresh vehemence to the raging discord. Like many of the other instruments of Elizabeth, this proclamation had a double, if not a triple, purpose: it attacked the Catholic discipline, and, while it seemed to be zealous for the new creed, coerced the ultra-Protestants. Communion was to be received under both kinds, but no irreverent words against "the sacrament of the altar" were to be tolerated.

Another proclamation ordered a conference to be held between the bishops and the Protestants. The church at Westminster was the place appointed (March 31, 1559). The parliament was to attend; and the Chancellor Bacon, a man well known for his hostility to the Catholics, was to preside. Whatever the bishops might think with regard either to obeying a royal proclamation in such a matter, or to the partiality, not to say artfulness, which they had every reason to expect, they thought it best to nominate a small body of disputants. These were seven in number: the three bishops of Winchester, of Coventry and Lichfield, and of Lincoln; with Cole, the dean of St. Paul's; Nicholas Harpsfeld, the archdeacon of Canterbury; and the archdeacons of Lewes and of Middlesex. Feckenham, the abbot of Westminster, was also present.*

When they entered the church, they found seats prepared for them on one side of the choir, and for their adversaries, amongst whom were Jewell, Grindal, Cox, and Sandes, upon the other. The queen's

hoc quinquennio, Dei beneficio, latuimus, in suggestis, maxime coram regina nostra Elizabetha, contra intonamus; pontificem Romanum vere antichristum, et traditiones pro maxima sui parte meras esse blasphemias." * Stowe says four bishops were appointed.

council, already pledged to the Protestants, sat as umpires towards the altar end, with their faces to the west. The questions regarded worship, and the administration of the sacraments, in the vulgar tongue; the authority of "every church to appoint, take away, and change ceremonies and ecclesiastical rites, so the same be to edification;" and, lastly, regarding the mass being a true "propitiatory" sacrifice.

As it is difficult to reconcile the brief account of Camden with that of Hayward, and as Stowe has contented himself with reproducing the government account, which is highly coloured, it will suffice to add with Stowe and Camden, that the discussion "came to nothing:" they could not agree even upon the method of discussion, the bishops insisting upon the logical method common in the universities; and the lords of the council first requesting, and then sharply demanding, that an arrangement, which they had thought proper to make, should be accepted and adhered to. In the words of the government account, "the disorder, stubbornness, and self-will" of the bishops, "made frustrate the godly and most Christian purpose of the queen's majesty." Such terms need no interpretation.

The Catholics declared aloud that it was unfair thus to bind them, and still more to appoint Bacon as the arbiter; that the matters propounded were matters that ought to be referred to the Holy See, were not matters called in question by any one in the Church; and, in short, that the tendency of such discussions always was to bend to the sway of the sceptre.

Towards the close of the conference, White and Watson, the bishops of Winchester and Lincoln, seeing but too clearly that the coronation oath was already violated, and that Elizabeth was devising measures most perilous to the souls of the people, declared aloud that she and the advisers of this revolt from the "Church of Rome," ought to be struck with excommunication (April 3).

As excommunication is a cutting off from the Church, it might be thought that Elizabeth, if she sincerely disbelieved the Church, would have smiled at being declared to be what she wished to be. This, however, would have been too plain for her purpose: the mass of the people would have seen the violence of the change, and would perhaps have adhered to the ancient faith. It was her purpose to make her subjects think that there was no change; and with this purpose at heart, she and her ministers could not endure the plain speaking of the two bishops; and, therefore, in the true spirit of the reign, committed them to the Tower. The other Catholic disputants were bound to make daily and personal appearance before the council, and, at last, were heavily fined: a proof of the degree of freedom of speech in this celebrated but abortive discussion.*

On Whitsunday (May 8), the parliament granted the large subsidy of two and eight-pence in the pound upon movables, and four shillings in the pound upon landed property. It then closed its proceedings, and broke up.

On that very day, by its "authority," began the new service in English, and the removal of the images of the saints. This was followed, when now the queen's visitors had been some time busy amongst the different parishes, by the public burning, in many parts of London, of "all the roods and other images of the churches." After the image of Christ and the reminiscences of Calvary were thus given to the flames, it is but a trifle that "vestments, altar-cloths, books, banners, sepulchres, and rood-lofts were burned." Whilst the queen's visitors were thus insulting the cross, the queen herself had a crucifix in her chapel: and thus did she, during her whole reign, delight to enshroud her real sentiments in double-meaning actions, and speeches, and proclamations.†

* Compare Stowe ad an.; Camd. (pp. 12 and 13), Hayw. (pp. 19, 20, &c.), Holingshed; Strype's Annals of Reform. under Eliz. c. 5.

† Stowe, Holingsh., Heyl. Ref. p. 140. Heylin adds, that the

In accordance with the new statute, the administration of the oath of supremacy was, meantime, busily and often tumultuously proceeding.* It was first tendered to the bishops. Of all those who were then living, only one, Anthony Kitchen of Llandaff, was base enough to take it. The rest were deprived of everything; lands, honours, and, for the most part, of liberty. Heath, the archbishop of York, after some imprisonment, was allowed, we are told, to retire to a little farm at Chobham in Surrey, and there had the dubious favour of an occasional visit from the queen. Those that were shut up more closely, were Bonner of London, the famous diplomatist; Cuthbert Tunstall of Durham, "highly accomplished," says Camden, "in every kind of polite literature;" Thomas Thurlbey of Ely, who had displayed his skill and prudence in the treaties of Château-Cambresis and Upsetlington, only just concluded with France and Scotland; Gilbert Bourn of Bath and Wells, an excellent prelate, adds Camden; John Christopherson of Chester, skilled in Greek, who had written a faithful translation of many portions of Eusebius and Philo; John White of Winchester, who to the usual amount of learning added the charms of poetry;† Thomas Watson of Lincoln, a

crucifix remained in the chapel until the queen's fool, instigated by Knowles, the queen's near kinsman, broke it in pieces. "Parlamento dimisso, ex ejusdem authoritate liturgia lingua populari in ecclesias illico ducitur," &c.—Camd. 1559, p. 22.

* Not fully comprehending the meaning of the new act, or, rather, not being able to separate the idea of the ruler of the Church from that of its chief priest, the people hesitated not to say that the queen was making herself the head of the Church in England in such a way as if she could celebrate divine service. She therefore issued an explanation: she challenged to herself, she said, only "supreme rule and power over all ranks in the realm of England, whether they be ecclesiastical or laical;" in such a manner that "no extraneous power hath or ought to have over them any jurisdiction or authority." —Camd. p. 26, an. 1559.

† "As the times went," adds Camden, who is evidently not in love with such zeal as Winchester and Lincoln had displayed. However, the times that heard the warblings of Surrey and Wyatt, and dawned upon the cradle of Shakspeare, were times when it was no small praise to be a poet, "as the times went."—Chester was now dead.

very learned theologian, but too grave and earnest for the panegyrists of Elizabeth; Ralph Baines of Coventry and Lichfield, who, in the reign of Francis I., was Regius Professor of Hebrew in the university of Paris; Owen Oglethorp of Carlisle, too well known for usurping the archiepiscopal office at the coronation; James Turberville of Exeter; and David Pole of Peterborough. These prelates, we are told by one of the heads of the universities, "were inferior in learning and holiness to none of the bishops of Europe."* To this company of glorious confessors was added Feckenham, the abbot of Westminster, a man whose benefactions to the poor, as Camden admits, "allured the minds of his adversaries to benevolence."

Notwithstanding the vigilance with which the ports were guarded, three bishops escaped to the continent. These were Cuthbert Scott of Chester, Richard Pate of Worcester, and Thomas Goldwell of St. Asaph's. Some religious also of the restored convents, besides Henry, Lord Morley, Inglefeld and Peckham, who had both held office in the reign of Mary, Richard Shelley, "prior of the order of St. John's in England," and others, contrived to quit the kingdom.†

The exaction of the oath of supremacy was, meantime, proceeding in all parts of the country. We have the testimony of the Protestant writers, that it was refused by eighty "rectors" of churches, fifty prebendaries, fifteen presidents of colleges, twelve archdeacons, twelve deans, and six abbots and abbesses.‡

Cardinal Allen, who travelled through a consider-

* Card. Allen, Respons. ad Persec. ap. Bridg. Concert. p. 315.

† Camd. 1559, p. 22, &c., and an. 1560, p. 46. It seems, from Elizabeth's own words, that the bishops would have been treated with greater rigour had it not been for the repeated entreaties of the emperor. As it was, she positively refused his request to allow Catholics the use of only one church in every city. The emperor argued briefly but cogently, and most graciously, that the Catholics should have liberty to exercise the religion of their fathers. He knew not the secret plan: he knew not a genuine Tudor's obstinacy: "semper eadem."—See one of Ferdin.'s lett. in Str. Ann. El. 2nd App. D; and Camd. pp. 27 and 28.

‡ Compare Camd. p. 23, and Heyl.

able part of England soon after these events, and who was intimately acquainted with many of those who resigned, gives very nearly the same account. He says that besides the bishops, the abbot of Westminster, four priors of religious houses, and three entire religious communities, there were twelve cathedral deans, fourteen archdeacons, more than sixty canons of cathedral churches, fifteen rectors of university colleges, and more than twenty professors and doctors, and more than a hundred of those priests who were most remarkable both for position and reputation.*

The effect produced upon the universities was briefly but effectively told by Jewell, the Protestant bishop: "There is a dismal solitude in our universities; the young men are flying about in all directions, rather than come to an agreement in matters of religion."†

Before the Catholic bishops had been thus removed, that part of the property of their sees, which Mary had restored to them, was again confiscated. But, after their refusal of the oath, all their temporalities were seized. The queen found this an excellent opportunity for making any amount of appropriation, as an Act of Parliament had empowered her to grant tenths and parsonages to the bishops, in exchange for lands. No auditors or other controlling power being appointed, the nature of the exchange may be readily surmised. Indeed, all the temporalities having been seized according to law, the queen had at least a plausible, and perhaps a legal, title to retain possession. This she actually did to a considerable extent, as is evident in the numerous exceptions which, in respect to the greater sees, clogged her writs for restoring the temporalities. The interval between the end of the parliament, the deprivation of the old bishops, and the consecration of the new, "was to be taken up," says Heylin, "in the execution of such surveys, and making such advantages of them as

* Respons. ad Persec. ap. Concert. p. 315, *b*.

† Zurich Letters, xvi. vol. ii. p. 148, &c.

most redounded to the profit of the queen and her courtiers."* This method was repeated when any of the sees became vacant, "till the best flowers," says the same writer, "in the whole garden of the Church had been culled out of it." Having expelled the bishops, and seized their property, Elizabeth immediately took measures for filling their places. The archbishopric of Canterbury was, therefore, offered first, it seems, to Dr. Nicholas Wotton, dean of Canterbury and York, "who, grown in years," says Heylin, "and still a well-wisher to the Pope, desired to be excused." It was, finally, given to Dr. Matthew Parker, one of Anne Boleyn's chaplains. Parker's congé d'élire was signed July 18. He was appointed Aug. 1. He was not made archbishop until Dec. 18, unexpected difficulties impeding every step in this new state of things.

In obedience to the queen's mandate (not the first that had been issued), four real or pretended bishops assembled to perform the consecration.

Of these four, not one had any ecclesiastical jurisdiction; and two of them had only a nominal consecration. They were the following: William Barlow, the deprived bishop of Bath and Wells and now bishop-elect of Chichester, and John Hodgskin, the deprived suffragan bishop of Bedford, both of whom had been consecrated, it seems, by the Catholic rite; as well as John Scory, formerly bishop of Chichester, and now bishop-elect of Hereford; and Milo Coverdale,

* Camd. an. 1560, p. 50; Str. Ann. El. chap. 2, pp. 64 and 67; Heylin, pp. 120 and 121; Rymer, in the years 1559, 1560, &c., especially with regard to Winchester, Durham, and York. Heylin was not born till the middle of Elizabeth's reign; but, as Archbishop Laud's chaplain, he had opportunities which few possessed.

Another and a permanent source of revenue to the queen, and profit to her courtiers, was opened by one of the statutes in her first parliament. This forbade the bishops to give or let their lands for more than twenty-one years, except to the queen and her successors. This clause, "Pro Regina," proved a loss, says Camden, to the Anglican establishment, but a gain to courtiers, who abused the queen's benignity, as he terms it, and to the bishops who were intent upon their own profits ("et episcopis in rem suam attentis, quæstuosa").—Camd. pp. 21 and 22.

formerly bishop of Exeter, both of whom had been consecrated by the ordinal of Edward VI. These men, empowered merely by the crown, and themselves inclined to make short work of the forms of the Catholic pontifical, proceeded now to their own mode of consecration, in the chapel at Lambeth Palace. Barlow was vested only in his cappa; Scory and Hodgskin in surplices; and Coverdale in a cloth cassock.

After the sermon and various prayers according to Act of Parliament, the four bishops imposed hands upon Parker, saying: "Receive the Holy Ghost, and remember to stir up the grace of God which is now in thee, by the imposition of hands. For God has not given to us the spirit of fear, but of power, love, and sobriety."

Then placing the Bible in his hands, they said: "See that you be diligent in reading, exhorting, and teaching; and assiduously meditate upon what is written in these books. In this be not slothful, so that the profit derived from it may be known and evident to all. Take especial care of what regards yourself, and the office of teaching. For, so doing, you shall save, through Jesus Christ our Lord, not only yourself, but your hearers also."

Then, without delivering the pastoral staff, Barlow proceeded with the communion service, in which all the bishops and some others received. Thus terminated this novel mode of episcopal consecration.*

* "Post orationes et suffragia quædam juxta formam libri auctoritate parliamenti editi, apud Deum habita, Cicestrensis, Herefordensis, suffraganeus Bedfordiensis et Milo Coverdallus manibus archiepiscopo impositis:—'Accipe,' inquiunt, 'Spiritum Sanctum, et gratiam Dei, quæ jam per impositionem manuum in te est, excitare memento: non enim timoris, sed virtutis, dilectionis, et sobrietatis spiritum dedit nobis Deus.' His ita dictis, Biblia sacra illi in manibus tradiderunt hujusmodi apud eum verba habentes:—'In legendo, hortando, et docendo vide diligens sis, atque ea meditare assidue, quæ in hisce libris scripta sunt. Noli in his segnis esse, quo incrementum inde proveniens omnibus innotescat et palam fiat. Cura, quæ ad te et ad docendi munus spectant diligenter. Hoc enim modo non te ipsum solum, sed et reliquos auditores tuos per Jesum

When Parker was thus intruded into the see of Canterbury, he "confirmed" Barlow in the see of Chichester, and Scory in that of Hereford. Amongst those that were selected for the other sees, were the men who from the beginning of the reign had been appointed to conduct the Protestant movement. Grindal, considered the best theologian of their body, was made bishop of London; Richard Cox, the Calvinistic preceptor of Edward VI., bishop of Ely; Edward Sandes, bishop of Worcester; John Jewell, considered their best-informed scholar, bishop of Salisbury; Robert Horne, praised by Camden for power of intellect, bishop of Winchester; and Richard Cheney, a devoted partisan of Luther's,* bishop of Gloucester.

Whatever the known tendencies of these men, whether Lutheran or Calvinistic, or any other of the new creeds, they were all alike enrolled in Elizabeth's new Church. Provided they conformed externally, and were cautious in their writings and conversations, they were all that their "supreme governor" desired.

The Catholics, however, could not regard men, thus violently thrust by the secular arm into the places of the imprisoned bishops, as the lawful successors of those bishops; nor, consequently, as the lawful successors of the Apostles; and they loudly declared their sentiments. Nor could they acknowledge the validity of a form which neither mentioned anything of the episcopal office, nor was accompanied by ceremonies which, necessarily, limited the form to that sole purpose. They objected, moreover, to the change

Christum Dominum nostrum salvabis.' Postquam hæc dixissent ad reliqua communionis solennia pergit Cicestren. nullum archiepiscopo tradens pastorale baculum, cum quo communicabant una archiepiscopus et illi episcopi supra nominati cum aliis etiam nonnullis. Finitis tandem, peractisque sacris, egreditur per borealem orientalis sacelli partis portam archiepiscopus."—See it in Wilk. iv. p. 198, being copied by a public notary, the registrar-general of the university of Cam., on 8th Jan. 1674, from the original in Corpus Christi Coll. Cam. See the Regist. in Mason, lib. iii.; and Machyn's Diary, Dec. 19, 1559, Camd. Soc.

* "Richardum Cheneium Luthero addictissimum."—Camd. p. 25.

or total omission of many of the ancient forms of consecration; such as that of the delivery of ring and crosier, as well as that of the anointing with oil; and of the benedictions.* Some even objected to Barlow, the consecrator, declaring that he himself had never been consecrated. Yet the admitted fact that he was treated by Henry VIII. as a bishop, would, in times less remarkable for change, have been a sufficient proof of his consecration. The direct proof has never been produced.

Supposing, however, that Barlow himself was consecrated, many were still incredulous regarding not only the manner but the very fact of Parker's consecration. The persons who confirmed Parker's election, met, as Heylin acknowledges, at the Nag's Head; and at this very Nag's Head, many declared that Parker was made or entitled a bishop. Although, however, the Catholic writers, Saunders, Allen, Harding, Bristow, Stapleton, and others, whether directly or indirectly, speaking of the clergy of the Establishment, treated them as laymen, and their bishops as superintendents or government inspectors, and although Udal, the Puritan, publicly termed the consecration of Parker "a hole-and-corner consecration," yet the Protestant writers, Jewell and others, made no attempt, for more than half a century, to produce the testimony of the Lambeth register. Camden was the first, it seems, that referred to it; but it was never actually produced

* "Pontificii enim illis tanquam pseudo-episcopis obtrectarunt, forsan eo, quod unctio, annulus, pedum pastorale, cum benedictionibus non adhibita; et quasi a tribus episcopis non essent rite ordinate, qui suam ascendendo ordinationem ad apostolicam authoritatem a Christo acceptam referre possent. Quod tamen, ut ex regestis patet, verissime poterant, piis precationibus, devota Spiritus Sancti invocatione, manuum trium ejusmodi episcoporum impositione, concione habita, et Eucharistia celebrata, consecrati."—(Camd. an. 1566, p. 103.) Camden's appeal to the registers regarding the prayer, sermon, Eucharist, and imposition of hands, and his silence regarding the ring and crosier, and anointing and blessing, points of itself to a change in the manner of consecration. Indeed, as the new Liturgy prescribed only the former, and nothing of the latter, it would be strange if the latter forms were used.

until the publication of a posthumous vindication of the Anglican orders, by Mason, in the reign of James I. When thus produced, one part of it was found to differ in form from the usual and more ancient entries; and it contained a slight discrepancy in the date. These circumstances; the fact that when Mason's work was first published, he himself had been dead several years; and, lastly, the very tardy production of so important a testimony, made many reject it as a forgery.*

When the men thus chosen and appointed had been thrust into the places of the imprisoned bishops, one of them, Horne of Winchester, sent his chancellor to the Clink, or Marshalsea, to tender to Bonner, who was there confined, the oath of supremacy. Bonner declared, in reply, that Horne had no right to make such a tender, being no bishop even by the law itself, as the law, unchanged in this respect since the time of Mary, recognized no other form of ordination than that of the Catholic Church. The question was carried to the Queen's Bench, and for several years was an insoluble riddle to the lawyers. Its abrupt termination, in 1566, gives some insight into the practical connection between parliament and the new pretended Church.

The question was tried in the Queen's Bench. After some prolonged and tedious proceedings, there being apparently no prospect of a decision favourable to Horne, the matter was cut short by an Act of Parliament, which referred to the common Prayer-book. The preamble of the act thus begins: "Forasmuch as divers questions, by overmuch boldness of speech and talk amongst many of the common sort of people, being unlearned, have lately grown upon the making

* See Mason, lib. iii. passim; and Introd. Address to the King, &c.; Udal's Demonstration of Discipline. The Holy See, it need scarcely be remarked, jealously watchful as it has always shown itself against the readministration of the sacraments which confer a character, has always reordained such of the Anglican clergy as have been converted and have been enrolled amongst the clergy of the Catholic Church.

and consecrating of archbishops and bishops within this realm, whether the same were and be duly and orderly done, according to the law or not, which is much tending to the slander of all the state of the clergy." It then states, that whereas, by authority of the parliament held in the first year of her present majesty, the queen was empowered to authorize persons, by letters patent, to "execute under her highness all manner of jurisdictions, privileges, pre-eminences, and authorities, in anywise touching or concerning any spiritual or ecclesiastical power or jurisdiction within this realm;" and whereas the 25 Henry VIII. for the election of bishops has been revived, and the "Book of Common Prayer and the Administration of Sacraments" has been fully established; and whereas, according to these forms, certain persons have been "duly elected, made, and consecrated bishops;" and whereas, moreover, the queen, "by her supreme power and authority, hath dispensed with all causes or doubts of any imperfection or disability that can or may in anywise be objected against the same," be it enacted that the order and form for ordaining bishops and priests that was set forth in the 5th and 6th years of Edward VI. shall stand good, and "shall from henceforth be used and observed in all places within this realm;" and that all things done "in or about any consecration," shall be deemed "good and perfect to all respects and purposes;" and "that all persons that have been or shall be" thus "made, ordered, or consecrated, archbishops, bishops, priests," and ministers, be declared and enacted to be, and shall be, "archbishops, bishops, priests," and ministers, "rightly made, ordered, and consecrated." *

The legal question was thus, arbitrarily indeed, but effectually, decided. Horne could and did tender the oath; and Bonner refusing it was doomed to confinement for the rest of his days. Whilst, however, the

* Str. Ann. El. ch. 49, p. 528; Stat. of the Realm, 8 Eliz. c. 1.

legal point was settled, the sees having been filled, the next difficulty was how to supply the numerous vacancies in the cathedral stalls, colleges, and parish churches: nor was it a difficulty easy to be removed. Men of tolerable acquirements, and willing to take the oath of supremacy, were comparatively few. The parochial livings do not appear to have been very generally pillaged, and yet their easy incomes could not purchase consciences enough for anything like the number of vacancies. Yet filled the places must be, or the people would be too much struck by the change, and Elizabeth's schemes would be imperilled. What was, therefore, done? Carpenters, blacksmiths, uneducated men of every mechanic art, were tempted by the good things of a life far above their usual sphere, and with no drawbacks of toilsome studies, and long trial of their vocation, in the midst of arduous duties. Enough that they were willing at once to take possession of the livings, and to do what they could in the new services: the rest was to follow as it could.

By these means, as Camden acknowledges, were the vacancies supplied. His remark, that these mechanics were "not less illiterate than the Popish priests," cannot conceal or disguise the fact.* Fuller, sarcastic and rampant as he is against everything Catholic, makes this express avowal when speaking of the slow progress of the reformation under Henry VIII: "These Protestant bishops were at this time (A.D. 1536) to encounter with the Popish clergy, equal in number, not inferior in learning." † Although by the "Popish clergy" he seems to mean the bishops, yet surely, taken as they were from the body of the clergy, they must present some resemblance to that body from which they were chosen.

Of those clergymen ordained in the Catholic times, who consented to take the oath, many seem to have

* "Multi ex officina mechanici, et non minus illiterati, quam ipsi pontificii sacerdotes, dignitates ecclesiasticas, præbendas, et opima sacerdotia consequuti sunt."

† Ch. Hist. sect. iv. No. 31.

calculated that another religious change might follow, and endeavoured to lull their consciences (as if the end could justify the means) by the miserable hope that, remaining in their parishes, they would at last obtain from the Holy See a dispensation from their oath; and in the mean time would be able to exclude Protestants from their churches, and render assistance to their brethren who had been expelled.*

It is unnecessary to dwell upon the comparatively minor changes, such as that of the second suppression of Westminster Abbey, and of the other monasteries which had been founded in Mary's reign; or of altars into tables. This latter change was preceded, if not caused, by an address to the queen, asserting the altars to be as figurative as the sacrifice and real presence; and calling upon Elizabeth to imitate Œcolampadius, Zuinglius, Calvin, and other Reformers, who "have in their reformed churches in Savoy, Helvetia, Basil, Geneva, Argentine, Worms, Frankfort, and other places, always taken away the altars." "From this notable paper of address to the queen," adds Strype, "she yielded to the taking away the altars, as by the effect it appears." † Lest, however, these changes should be too perceptible, various forms, those especially that strike at once the eye or ear, were carefully retained: the fasts were to be observed; the bread in the Lord's Supper was to be circular in shape; music was to be retained; and the old festivals with their eves were still to be kept; all, as Heylin plainly avows, "to come up the closer to those of Rome." ‡

* The following is Camden's party statement:—"Plurimis tamen pontificiorum sacerdotum magis ipsorum et religionis etiam suæ usui visum est obedientiam principi, Papæ authoritate renunciata, jurare vel hoc consilio, ut Protestantes ecclesiis suis excluderent, simulque suorum, qui abdicati erant inopiæ subvenirent," &c. "Hanc illi piam prudentiam instarque meriti existimarunt; ideoque Pontificem Rom. de juramento pro sua authoritate dispensaturum sperarunt."

† Strype's Ann. El. an. 1559, p. 160, &c.; Stowe, p. 640; Camd. pp. 25 and 26.

‡ Heylin's Eliz. pp. 111 and 124. See also Neal's Puritans. Heylin gives us, amongst others, the following specimen of Elizabeth's conduct as supreme governess:—"When Nowell, dean

"Thus," exclaims the chosen historian of Elizabeth's royal ministers—"thus was religion changed in England." Thus was "the religion of Protestants established by authority of parliament." * "The Christian world was astonished," that the change was so easily, and with so little commotion, effected. It was, however, brought about, he continues, slowly, and step by step. For more than a month after Mary's death, the only appearance of change was the administration of the oath of supremacy (A.D. 1558). On the twenty-seventh of December, 1558, was struck the second blow: the Epistle, Gospel, and Creed, were to be recited in English. Then came the prohibition to elevate the blessed sacrament. Not till the twenty-second of March, 1559, did the command appear for receiving under both kinds. On the twenty-fourth of June, in accordance with the Statute of Uniformity, the sacrifice of the Mass was abolished; and the service and administration of the sacraments were performed in English. Not till July was the Act of Supremacy passed; and not till August were the images of the saints, and of our Redeemer himself, broken and burnt.

Thus slowly and sadly was the external change of religion effected. To root out the faith from the hearts of the people, was a task still more difficult; and to this the government devoted its energies throughout the whole of this lengthened reign, and yet, to its vexation, after all its wiles and sanguinary statutes, it could Protestantize, at last, but little more than half the nation.†

of St. Paul's, had spoke less reverently, in a sermon preached before her, of the sign of the cross, she called aloud to him from her closet-window, commanding him to retire from that ungodly digression, and to return unto his text." In a similar manner she checked another who had attacked the real presence.—Heylin, p. 124.

* "Ita religio in Anglia mutata, orbe Christiano mirante, quod tam facile," &c.—(Camd. p. 26.) "Religione Protestantium authoritate parlamentaria jam constabilita," &c.—Ib. p. 27.

† Soames, in his "Elizabeth," a writer of strong bias in favour of everything Protestant, acknowledges that at the end of Elizabeth's

Having thus renewed the schism with the Holy See begun by Henry VIII., and having, moreover, interdicted the sacrifice of the Mass and the use of the old liturgies or service-books of the country, Elizabeth fancied that she could arrest the progress of change; and adopting for her practice, as well as her motto, the expression "semper eadem,"—"unchangeable," addressed herself to the task, more arduous than she had anticipated, of watching and subduing all opposition, both foreign and domestic.*

The disputes, however, regarding ecclesiastical "habits," and other matters of similar importance, which had raged under Edward VI., recommenced as soon as Protestantism was re-established, and ceased not until the more prominent points of Calvinism or Puritanism, and especially the rejection of the royal supremacy itself, became the battle-ground of the contending parties.

When Elizabeth found, after twenty years' experience, that new sects—or, as she disdainfully termed them, "new-fangledness"—were defying her code of uniformity, she vented her disappointment, in presence of her assembled parliament, in brief but bitter expressions: "All which if you, my lords of the clergy, do not amend, I mind to depose you: look you, therefore, well to your charges." †

reign one-third of the English were still Catholics. This statement, from such an historian, may fairly be considered as much below the truth.

* Camd. p. 27, an. 1559.

† Stowe, A.D. 1585, p. 702; Strype An. Eliz. passim.

CHAPTER XI.

PIUS THE FOURTH'S LETTER TO ELIZABETH—HE INVITES HER TO THE COUNCIL OF TRENT—ATTENDANCE AT CHURCH—DECISION AT THE COUNCIL OF TRENT—INCREASING RIGOUR OF THE LAWS—MARY, QUEEN OF SCOTS—HER CRY FOR RESCUE—INSURRECTION—ITS OBJECT—ITS IMPRUDENCE AND DEFEAT—DEATH OF NORTHUMBERLAND—INCREASE OF BEGGARY—ITS INHUMAN PUNISHMENT—PLAGUES AND PIRATES.

Grieving over the second fall of England from the ancient faith, the Pope, Pius IV., made an attempt, however hopeless, to reclaim Elizabeth. He called the Searcher of Hearts to witness his earnest desire for her security and honour, and for the stability of her kingdom, but, at the same time, advised her to be on her guard against self-interested counsellors, and entreated her to recognize the time of her visitation, and to return to the bosom of the Church, with a certain hope of obtaining from the authority given him by God all that was requisite, not only for salvation, but for establishing and strengthening the regal dignity.*

To stem the flood of schism and heresy, the general Council of Trent had been summoned by Pope Paul III. as early as 1542, but had met in its first session only in 1545. A plague and, afterwards, various wars interrupted its progress. Pius IV. made it one of his first objects to renew, and had the happiness to complete, the sessions of the council.

Having on this occasion requested the attendance of all princes, he directed to Elizabeth a second letter, one of invitation to the council. The legate, Martinegi, who bore the invitation, paused in Belgium, and requested to be allowed to proceed to the English court. He was met with an immediate refusal.

* Ap. Camd. an. 1560, p. 47.

Overlooking this affront, the Pope, by means of his legate in France, and of Throckmorton, the English ambassador at Paris, still endeavoured to persuade Elizabeth to send ambassadors to the council. The kings of France, Spain, and Portugal, likewise, by their letters, urged her to acquiesce: a general council, they said, was preferable to the opinions of a few even of the learned; was the only anchor of Christians, and the prop of kingdoms. Elizabeth was never backward in the war of words: she replied that she desired a general, but not a Roman council; as if the council in question were merely Roman, and not strictly general in the sense hitherto always understood. Elizabeth insidiously added, that it was not the Pope's, but the emperor's place to summon a council; that she recognized in the Pope no more authority than in any other bishop. In this statement she put the seal upon her unhappy schism: it was rebellion against St. Peter's See that had been the great sin of her father, Henry; it was rebellion against the same Holy See that, above every other characteristic, marked her own policy, and proved that, whatever other feature might be added to the Anglican secession, it was still primarily and substantially a return to the disobedience and spiritual usurpations of Elizabeth's tyrannical father.*

Whilst Elizabeth affected to scoff at the council, her Catholic subjects availed themselves of its meeting to obtain a decision regarding attendance at the Protestant Church. As soon as the change to the new service took place, many Catholics, and especially those that were really making salvation the "one thing necessary," found themselves obliged in conscience to relinquish the old churches, and each time, poor or rich, to pay the penalty of one shilling, or to take the consequences of nonpayment. Those who in their hearts clung to the ancient faith, but were too much wedded to the things of the earth, were dismayed

* Camd. an. 1561, p. 59.

at the inconveniences of their position. They sought, therefore, a middle course. Why, they began to say, why must we leave our old places of worship? we hate these changes, but our attendance, surely, is not an approbation of what we cannot help? Having soothed in this manner their own consciences, they endeavoured to lead their more resolute friends to imitate their example.

The latter were firm; but fearing for the salvation of those that acquiesced, they petitioned Cardinal Toleto to obtain in the synod a practical decision. To avoid exasperating the Protestants, they requested that this should not be done publicly, but privately by the more learned and pious of the theologians. If, the petitioners affirmed, if we can obey the law without endangering our souls and offending God, we will do so with pleasure; if not, we are willing to incur every extremity.

The answer, which was full of sympathy, declared that the question had been referred to some of the most learned of the council, forming a congregation of two archbishops, two bishops, besides Laynez, the general of the Jesuits, Peter de Soto, and four other eminent divines, and that, after a long scrutiny into the Holy Scriptures, the Fathers, and historical monuments, they had come to the unanimous decision, that attendance at the prayers or sermons of the Protestants was grievously sinful. Whilst giving this decision, they reminded the petitioners, amongst other examples, of the Christians of former ages, who preferred torments and death to hearing even the Mass of an Arian priest, or to be present in any act of Arian worship (A.D. 1562). How much more, they added, would such men have shrunk, not from Mass, but from a new service, the offspring of schism, the badge of open hatred of the Church.*

* The documents are quoted by More at full length, lib. iii. p. 66, &c. After this the Catholics were very exact in keeping from Protestant prayers; but many of them with regard to sermons were less particular, forgetting that reiterated assertions produce on many minds almost the same effect as solid reasons.

Whatever some Catholics might think about the lawfulness of going to church, it was evident enough to the government, that the penalties of the Act of Supremacy could not terrify to the extent which Elizabeth desired: the Catholics, on the contrary, were zealous in maintaining the supremacy of the Holy See; were, as the ensuing statute announced, "grown to marvellous outrage and licentious boldness."

To reduce them to the cringing acquiescence which Elizabeth sought, it was enacted, that all persons were to incur the "penalties, pains, and forfeitures of the præmunire, who by writing or teaching, in word or deed," should defend or assert the jurisdiction and authority of the see of Rome. If the justices did not certify such offences to the Queen's Bench within forty days, they were to be fined one hundred pounds.

Having thus endeavoured to silence the defenders of the Holy See, the act required all members of parliament, all persons taking degrees in the universities, all sheriffs, barristers, attorneys, schoolmasters, private tutors, and officers in any court whatever, and every other person at the lord chancellor's discretion, to take the oath of supremacy, under the same penalty of a præmunire for every offender, and of one hundred pounds for every conniving or negligent justice.

A second offence against either part of the statute, or any defence of the Pope's supremacy, or a refusal of the oath, was to be punished with "the same pains, forfeitures, judgment, and execution, as is used in cases of high treason." The offender, however, was not to incur corruption of blood; nor was his property to be after his death confiscated (A.D. 1563).*

These crushing enactments must have sorely tried the loyalty of men who, under severe provocation, had not lifted a finger against the queen or her ministers,—who had introduced no new religion, but had simply adhered, and wished to enable their children to adhere,

* Stat. of the Realm, 5 Eliz. c. 1; Camd. 1563, p. 71.

to the faith of their ancestors. Was it not enough that Protestantism, the very name of which was not forty years old, was made the religion of the state; and its professors, men of obscure birth, were raised to the honours and dignities, which, by the usages of the realm, had always belonged, at least in great measure, to the nobles? Must the Catholics, still the greater part of the nation, be compelled to renounce a religion which their fathers had handed down to them, which their reason itself did homage to, which they preferred to every other kind of liberty, and to life itself? They all, undoubtedly, felt that such tyranny was opposed to the very object for which society existed; but some began to ask, whether they ought not, at once, to strike for the freedom which was thus imperiously trampled down.

Whilst some of the Catholics were glowing with this just resentment, there was one point in which their indignation was shared by not a few even of the Protestants. This was the captivity of Mary, queen of Scots. Defeated by her rebellious subjects, who, unknown to her, had been reared to faction and treason by Elizabeth, Mary sought refuge with the queen of England (A.D. 1568). Ties of blood, and a kindly correspondence in letters, gave Mary some ground to anticipate a generous reception. She was bitterly undeceived. At first, indeed, she was welcomed with some appearance of kindness; but she soon found herself a captive. Exposed to the ignominy of an examination into her conduct during her reign in Scotland (under the pretence, indeed, of trying her enemies), she baffled the arts of the treacherous allies, the English government and the Scottish rebels; but found her prison-doors more effectually closed upon her than ever. She expostulated; but in vain.

The nation was not so hard-hearted as Elizabeth. They saw a young queen, beautiful and accomplished, put on trial, and left single-handed to do battle with all the craft of her enemies. Pity grew into admiration, when they saw her dignified but resolute deport-

ment in the conference at York. When they saw her enemies silenced, and yet she herself transferred to a dreary captivity, they were not only amazed, but indignant; for Mary was almost universally regarded as the true heir-apparent to the throne of England. So strong was her title, that it was by this right alone that her son, James VI. of Scotland, was, on the death of Elizabeth, peaceably crowned as James I. of England. Elizabeth, however, notwithstanding the uncertainty of men's minds, refused to name any one as her successor. Had she named Mary, she would have condemned herself for treatment so unworthy. In 1566, the House of Commons, dissatisfied with her previous reasons, had warmly debated the question. Several of the members, particularly Bell, Monson, Dutton, and Paul Wentworth, urged that the queen was bound to name her successor. When men first violently resume their rights, they are seldom moderate in their new enjoyment. Thus, indulging in an unwonted liberty of speech, the members not only declared that the nation's love was the bulwark of the throne, but broadly hinted that, unless Elizabeth complied with their suggestions, she would be, not the parent of her country, but its step-mother, nay, even its parricide. Elizabeth quelled their spirit for a time, by sending for a certain number of both houses, and giving them a lecture of mingled sternness, severity, and cajolery.*

Whilst men thus felt, and occasionally expressed, their dissatisfaction, or were watching the struggles of Mary's faithful adherents in Scotland, a marriage was projected between Mary and the duke of Norfolk. This nobleman, however, was already treated with coldness by Elizabeth, as one of the bold spirits who had lately in parliament insisted that Elizabeth ought to name her successor. His combination with some of the old nobility against Cecil and his party, increased his disgrace. On the discovery of the

* Camd. an. 1566, pp. 98—103; Labanoff's Letters, passim.

intended marriage, he was now imprisoned, and some of his friends were put to the torture; while the rigour of Mary's confinement was increased. Trembling at the known enmity of her new keepers, the Scottish queen now implored help from several families which had formerly offered their services.

These families were the Tempests, Ratcliffes, Markenfields, Nortons, Dacres, Swinburns, and others of ancient blood, the virtual rulers of the North. Well did they know that an attempt against Elizabeth's flagrant injustice would be construed into an attempt against her crown. Many amongst them, however, determined to hazard all for Mary's rescue.

The queen's ministers observed an uneasy feeling in the North, and had remarked a frequent interchange of visits between the Catholic earls of Westmoreland and Northumberland, who had been accused of supporting the plans of Norfolk. Sussex, the queen's "President of the North," questioned the two noblemen upon the purpose of these visits. Scarcely had they given their answer and returned home, when they were again required to make their appearance. They excused themselves. Not many days however elapsed, when they received a royal mandate, peremptorily requiring their presence at court. While Northumberland was still hesitating what to do, he was informed that an armed force was approaching. He now, at once, made up his mind: he fled to the residence of the earl of Westmoreland, where the more resolute of Mary's friends had already assembled. Some, however, were unwilling to plunge into civil war, without having maturely examined how far such an extreme measure was justified by their peculiar circumstances. To procure the advice of priests who had remained faithful to the Holy See, was by no means difficult. Several were collected together, and were asked whether it were lawful to arm in defence of the old nobility, and of the ancient rights and freedom of the nation. The majority returned an answer in the negative. Those, however, that asked

the question, seemed to have done so in hopes of others being drawn to their standard: they themselves, it appears, had already made up their minds. They preferred the advice of the minority, especially, says Camden, of Nicholas Morton, formerly a canon of York Cathedral, and flew, at once, to arms. On Clifford Moor they marshalled six hundred horse and four thousand five hundred foot. Their standards bore, some a representation of the five wounds of our Lord, and others the chalice, the emblem of the sacrifice of the Mass. Their object was, they loudly proclaimed, "to restore the religion of their ancestors;" to remove evil councillors from court, and to replace the trampled nobles in freedom and favour. In all this, they added, they intended no rebellion against the queen: they were her most devoted subjects.

With such haste had they rushed into the struggle, that Lord Dacre, one of their most powerful abettors, so far from being able to co-operate, was actually at court; and the gentry of Norfolk, who were devotedly attached to the imprisoned duke, and soon after conspired to effect his rescue, do not appear to have been at all consulted.*

They soon perceived the full extent of their rashness. They besieged and captured Castle Barnard; and after having entered Durham, they slowly marched from place to place, destroying the Book of Common Prayer and the new version of the Bible, and everywhere expelling Elizabeth's clergy, putting up altars in the old churches, and hearing Mass; but they found their ranks but slightly augmented, whilst the queen of Scots, the chief cause of their rising, says Camden, had been removed from Tutbury to the strong city of

* Camd. an. 1569, pp. 157—172; Stowe. Stowe says that "they mustered on Clifford Moor, nigh unto Bramham Moor, where they were, one thousand six hundred horsemen and four thousand footmen, which was the greatest number that ever they were;" and yet, a page further on, he tells us that the insurgents were "ten thousand strong, horse and foot" (p. 664).

Coventry, and hostile forces were rapidly accumulating on all sides, and threatening to surround them. Thus disappointed, the insurgents disbanded; and many of them were put to death by martial law. Sir George Bowes, the marshal of the royal army, told Stowe, with his own lips, that "he did see them executed in every market-town, and other places betwixt Newcastle and Netherby, about sixty miles in length and forty miles in breadth." The leaders had, meantime, fled across the Scottish border. Northumberland was afterwards betrayed to Elizabeth. He gave up his prison-hours, almost entirely, to prayer and the various exercises of penance. He had always been a general favourite; and his cheerfulness in adversity strengthened the impression. A rumour now arose, that he was to be pardoned; and many flocked to him to offer their congratulations. His reply was that of a true Christian: "As to my body," he said, "I own I should prefer life, not so much for myself, as for my wife and children and friends; but only provided my conscience remain uninjured. Otherwise, welcome death, and farewell life." The rumour, however, was false: the earl was tried and condemned. With a blithe countenance, and the sign of the cross, he mounted the scaffold. He was declaring himself a child of that Church which is one and yet extends over the whole earth, but that he knew nothing of the new Anglican Church, when Palmer, a Protestant minister, interrupted him, telling him he was an obstinate Papist, a member of the Roman not of the Catholic Church. "What you call Roman," answered the earl, "is the Catholic Church, founded upon the doctrine of the Apostles, with Christ Jesus himself for its corner-stone; established in the blood of martyrs, adorned by the confessions of the holy Fathers, and remaining always the same, against which (as Christ our Saviour has said) the gates of hell shall not prevail." He expressed great sorrow that so many of the poorer sort had suffered, through their love for himself and for God's religion. As, finally, he finished

the words, "Lord, receive my soul," his head fell, and immediately, with a general groan, the people with one voice, a voice of thunder, repeated his last words, imploring mercy upon his soul.*

Thus terminated the revolt of the North and its innumerable subsequent executions.

When a large population is smarting under laws evidently tyrannical, a proportion is sure to be ready for any extremes. A bold leader, the possession of arms,—and an insurrection before prudent arrangements can be made, is almost inevitable. Thus was it in the recent revolt. Of the numerous gentry of the North, not ten, as Sadler, the queen's commissioner, informed his mistress, were favourable to Elizabeth's changes in religion. Yet the proportion of these men that was inclined to draw the sword, was very inconsiderable. When the royal banner was unfurled, the majority of those that arrayed themselves beneath it were Catholics. When the revolt was crushed, the second rising, under Dacre, only served to show still more clearly how little premeditation there was in the first. Both efforts were alike hasty and abortive; proving, indeed, by the tranquil ease with which the Mass was restored, where the sympathy of the people really was; but proving, no less, that that sympathy had not blinded the majority to the course suggested by prudence or cowardice.

These rebellions and their direful punishment were not by any means the only misfortunes of Elizabeth's reign. To pass over the tyrannical statutes against

* Camd. an. 1569—1572; Saund.; Mart. Com. Northumb. ap. "Concertatio," p. 45, *b*. Had not many Catholics united against the revolt, to all appearance it must have been successful. Sadler thus, in his Protestant fashion, describes the attachment of the whole population of the North to the Catholic faith:—"There be not in all this country ten gentlemen that do favour and allow of her Majesty's proceedings in the cause of religion; and the common people be ignorant, full of superstition, and altogether blinded with the old Popish doctrine."—Sadler's State Papers, vol. ii. (Dec. 6, 1569, &c.), p. 817, &c.

"The Concertatio" is a contemporary work, or rather a collection of contemporary historical pieces.

the bulk of the nation, as well as the repeated foreign wars and enormous monopolies, this reign was marked again and again, from beginning to end, with many grievous afflictions. Repeated plagues, which, under various forms, had returned during the whole century to scourge the nation, were still ravaging its population, and to such an extent, that at Michaelmas, 1564, the rich abandoned the capital, and the courts of justice were closed. The frightful increase of beggary which marked the seizure of church property was undiminished, and being aggravated by recent dearth more than once, it was now met in the same inhuman spirit as in the time of Edward VI. Poverty was again made a crime. There was no scrutiny to separate artful imposition from unavoidable misfortune. They were punished alike: no Christian tenderness in any case. "It was enacted," says Stowe, "that all persons above the age of fourteen years being taken begging, should be whipped, and burned through the gristle of the right ear, with a hot iron of one inch compass, for the first time so taken." *

To add to all this misery, the coasts were insulted and the narrow seas infested by pirates. These men were of various nations, French, English, and Flemings. They seem to have continued unmolested until they had the audacity to attack the earl of Worcester, the queen's special envoy to the king of France (A.D. 1573). The earl was going to the christening of the king's daughter, and was carrying with him a font of gold, weighing three hundred and twenty-six ounces, when he was assailed and despoiled, and then allowed to proceed. This indignity aroused the government, and a squadron having scoured the seas, twenty pirate ships and nine hundred prisoners were captured, besides fifteen merchant-vessels, the prizes of the buccaneers.† Even then the sea was not safe: many complaints were made of piracies committed by the Flushing people. A new expedition captured eight of

* Stowe, an. 1564, 1568, and 1572. † Ib. p. 674.

their ships, manned by two hundred and twenty men (A.D. 1576). Seven years later, the evil was almost as great as at first; the "outrageous sea-rovers," as Stowe calls them, being in this instance Englishmen, and being "many in number and well appointed." It was again checked for the time by the capture of ten sail, three of which had been merchantmen (A.D. 1583).*

These few instances will suffice to show, not only the general condition of England in the reign of Elizabeth, but the many calamities which Catholics, in addition to their own peculiar afflictions, had to undergo in common with the rest of their countrymen.

* Stowe.

CHAPTER XII.

DR. ALLEN—HIS ZEAL AGAINST ATTENDANCE AT CHURCH AND AGAINST HERESY—THE SEMINARY OF DOUAY—ALLEN'S PERSONAL APPEARANCE, CHARACTER, AND INFLUENCE—THE COURSE OF STUDY—THE FIRST PRIESTS OF THE NEW SEMINARY—THE REMNANT OF THE ENGLISH HIERARCHY AT THE HOLY SEE—THE POPE'S DECREE—FELTON'S BOLDNESS AND DEATH—THE RIGOUR OF THE PENAL LAWS INCREASED—SEARCHES AND ARRESTS—TRIAL OF ROLAND JENKS—CUTHBERT MAINE'S CONVERSION, MISSIONARY LIFE, AND MARTYRDOM—JOHN NELSON—THE DOUAY SEMINARY TAKES REFUGE AT RHEIMS—EVERARD HANSE—A DOMESTIC ENEMY: HIS REPENTANCE—THE ENGLISH HOSPITAL AND COLLEGE AT ROME—ITS EARLY TROUBLES.

THE schemes of Elizabeth against the old religion had in some degree succeeded. The great body of the Catholics had no means of receiving the help of the sacraments or the direct teaching of the Church. Some, indeed, found access to the surviving priests that had remained faithful to the Holy See. This, however, was perilous to the life and property of both parties. Still worse, the number of such priests was, in the natural course of things, diminishing year after year. No help was to be found in the two universities: they, like all the other property of the Church, had been seized, and given to the new church by law established. It was high time that some resource, some means of educating for the priesthood, should immediately be found. To meet this emergency, God raised up as his humble instrument a poor, but holy and learned, English priest. Nor was the Holy See wanting to its high destiny. St. Gregory the Great had sent into England those that were either to convert it, or to suffer and die for the faith. He and his successors had, from that moment to the reign of Elizabeth, watched over it, giving its bishops jurisdic-

tion and all possible aid. These bishops, its faithful teachers, were now, after a welcome of nearly a thousand years, slain or imprisoned or exiled. The good work must begin again. Priests devoted to the Chair of St. Peter must again land in England; not to be publicly received, as in the days of Ethelbert, but to be calumniated, hunted down, put to death. Can men be found to cheer with God's teaching and grace the faithful laity on such terms? Yes, the heroism of the early Christians still lives in the faithful heart of Holy Church. Henceforth the history of the Church in England is but little more than that of the dangers and sufferings of these missionary priests, and of such of the laity as were most zealous to receive and extend the blessings thus communicated.

The English priest raised up to meet the emergency was Dr. William Allen, better known by his subsequent title of Cardinal Allen. He was born of a respectable family in Lancashire. Educated in Oriel College, Oxford, he attracted general attention by his abilities and virtues. In 1556, he became proctor of the university, and still remaining at Oxford, and being probably in deacon's orders, was made a canon of the cathedral of York.

"As soon as religion changed in England" (the words are Camden's), Allen exerted himself without disguise to keep alive the faith of those around him, and to reclaim those who had gone astray. Even when the oath of supremacy had been passed, and was in the course of being administered on all sides, he still continued, and for a time even redoubled, his endeavours. His zeal evoked all the bitterness of the Reformers; and fully aware of his danger, he at last eluded it by a hasty flight to Louvain.

Whilst in that city, he wrote a treatise on Purgatory, against Jewell and other Protestants. Falling soon after into a sickness which baffled the skill of his physicians, he was advised to try his native air. He, therefore, secretly returned to Lancashire, and soon began to rally. In this state of convalescence, per-

The first priests ordained at the new seminary, proved by their learning and virtues the soundness of their education. Amongst them were Bristow, "noted," says Wood, "for his acute parts," Ford, Robinson, and Gregory Martin. The last-mentioned was one of the first scholars appointed to St. John's College, by its founder, Sir Thomas White (A.D. 1557). Wood says: "He was a most excellent linguist, exactly read and versed in the Sacred Scriptures; and went beyond all of his time in humane literature, whether in poetry or prose." He afterwards became the chief translator of the Rheims Testament. In the course of time, he was summoned by Gregory XIII. to Rome, to assist in forming the new English college. He has left proofs of his great learning, in a variety of works, which, unfortunately, remain, for the most part, still in manuscript. Amongst these were a "Tragedy of Cyrus," still, says Pits, in the College of St. John the Baptist, Oxford; a Dictionary of Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and English, which he never finished; a "Compendium of History;" and a "Detection of the Corruptions of the English Bible."*

Whilst the English government was watching, with no small vexation, the growth of the little seminary at Douay, it was astonished and enraged at the publication, in the very heart of London, of the Pope's formal excommunication of Elizabeth.

The chair of St. Peter was now filled by Pius V. This saintly and energetic pontiff had witnessed the negotiations which his predecessor had in vain attempted to open with Elizabeth. He knew, from the baffled mediations of the emperor of Germany and

* Pitsei, De Illust. Angliæ Script. This elegant Latin scholar was one of Allen's contemporaries, and, like him, an exile for the faith.

A. Wood's Athenæ, v. pp. 168—170; Chall.'s Mem. of Miss. Priests (Introd.); Camd. an. 1580, p. 314. Camden's derivation of the word "seminary" is too limited. A seminary was not intended necessarily to "scatter the seeds of religion in England;" it was a seed-bed or nursery of religion, enjoined by the Council of Trent to be, as far as possible, established in every part of the Catholic Church.

other sovereigns, and from the increasing pressure of the penal laws, that it was Elizabeth's purpose not merely to trample upon, but to destroy that obedience to the Holy See, which is the very life of Catholicity. What, therefore, was now his duty? Was it to wait, in silence, until that destruction was completed? If, indeed, he spoke, the attempt to destroy might be more rapid, more severe to life and property; but souls were at stake: Elizabeth and her hierarchy were studiously labouring to make the ignorant believe that nothing more was sought by government, than to purge away certain corrupt practices which submission to Rome had introduced; and that this being effected, the Church of England would become an exact copy of the old British, and even of the Anglo-Saxon Church. The attempt to impose this chimera upon the people, is evident from the disguised but yet clear language of Parker, Spelman, and various other controversial and historical writers.*

The Pope felt, undoubtedly, that whatever might befall the property and persons of the living generation of English Catholics, it was time to provide for their souls, at any cost; it was time for the warning voice of St. Peter to be heard; it was time to show what the see of St. Peter thought of the changes in the Church of England.

The remnant of the old English hierarchy that had escaped from Elizabeth's tyranny, were around him: the bishop of St. Asaph's, the bishop elect of Bangor, the dean of Hereford, the rector of Lincoln College, a prebendary of York, and various doctors of divinity and other clergymen. With these witnesses of the changes in England, he ordered proceedings for heresy to begin against Elizabeth; but not until he knew that she herself fomented rebellion in Belgium, France, and Scotland, and had dared to put the injured Mary, queen of Scots, upon her trial.

Whilst these proceedings at Rome were continuing,

* See Introduction to the present volume.

Pius ceased not to urge France and Spain to avenge the outraged independence of kings, so far, at least, as to snatch Mary from the grasp of her unfeeling cousin. When, after some months, the proceedings were closed, and, by clear facts, it was proved that Elizabeth was guilty of departing from the ancient faith, of manifest heresy, Pius still delayed sentence until he had heard the various objections that could be made to it, and he then issued the solemn decree against Elizabeth of excommunication from the Holy Church. The English queen and her advisers might affect to laugh; but "whatever you shall bind on earth, shall be bound also in heaven."

It was then usual that a prince, when excommunicated (and no one who has not been a Catholic is ever excommunicated), should, if he persisted in his evil course, be declared incapable of ruling. Indeed, if he were put under the most solemn kind of excommunication, all the faithful were bound in conscience to avoid him. It followed, that as long as almost the whole nation remained faithfully Catholic, he must either by submission be released from excommunication, or, for a time at least, must yield his place to another. Whether from this logical sequence, or from the direct supposition of his being unworthy to rule, it had long been usual both for princes under excommunication to be declared incapable of reigning, and for their subjects to be declared released from promises of allegiance, to which they could no longer in common justice be compelled to adhere. From this sentence of deprivation, Elizabeth was not excepted, any more than her father had been. This twofold sentence was signed immediately after the close of the northern rebellion (Feb. 25, 1570).

On the fifteenth of the following May, those Londoners who early in the morning passed the bishop of London's palace in St. Paul's church-yard, were surprised to see attached to the gates a copy of this bull of excommunication and deposition. Well-paid informers were everywhere on the watch in those

miserable days, and the news of an act thus daringly achieved, despite of the dangers of a præmunire, flew at once to the ears of Elizabeth's ministers. Great was their wrath, and equally great their immediate activity. The whole town was ransacked. Confusion everywhere; but woe to the poor Catholics: the pursuivants and their armed followers were more busy and ruthless than ever; destroying, searching, robbing. Another copy of the bull is discovered. The owner, a student of Lincoln's Inn, is dragged away to the rack. "Who affixed the bull?" is the demand of the torturers. "Felton is the man," he gasps, as they strain his limbs. Again there is the bustling importance and arrogance of little men in authority; and Felton, a real prize, a man of wealth and rank and learning, is hurried before the council. No need of the rack: he openly avows that he it was that affixed the bull. He is required to name his accomplices. He refuses; nor can all their tortures wring more from his unyielding heart. He is condemned to die as a traitor, a man whose heroic constancy might have proved his country's choicest bulwark. He dies, close to the gates of the bishop of London's palace, glorying in what his conscience approved, and refusing the queen any other title than that of a pretender, yet sending her his diamond ring in token of his forgiveness.

Each act of passive resistance on the part of the Catholics had hitherto been met by increased rigour. While, however, great numbers of the Catholics remained firm to the faith in the midst of great sufferings, the queen and her ministers remained obstinately bent upon the success of their plans against them, and especially against everything like attachment to Rome. Baffled in their attempt to weed out the priesthood, no less than in that to make the simple and ignorant think that they might embrace Elizabeth's rites and creed and yet continue Catholics, they now proceeded to the utmost extremities. Imprisonment, and loss of property, and the threat of death, having failed, the government had recourse to

the horrors of the torture-chamber, and to what the law had already twice awarded,—the public execution by knife and gibbet. It was now by act of parliament made high treason, even for a first offence, to declare in any work that the queen was a heretic or schismatic, no less than to declare her a tyrant and usurper. It was made treason to "bring from the city of Rome to England," or to use any writing or instrument from the Pope, whatever "might be its contents." It was no less treason to give or receive absolution, in virtue of any written jurisdiction from the Holy See, although it was the general practice of the Church to give such power only in writing. Even the mere fact of possessing an Agnus-Dei, or beads, or crosses, or pictures, blessed by the Pope, or by the missionaries sent by him, was now subjected to the heavy punishment of a præmunire. Those Catholics that had fled their country were not altogether out of the reach of these tyrannical enactments: unless they returned within six months after proclamation to that effect, even if they had procured a formal leave of absence, they forfeited to the Crown for life their goods and chattels, and their landed revenues (April, 1571).*

Of the searches and punishments that followed these new penal laws some idea may be formed from even the following dry extract:—

On "Palm Sunday" (A.D. 1574) "there was taken, saying of Mass in the Lord Morley's house, within Aldgate of London, one Alban Dolman, priest; and the Lady Morley, with her children, and divers others, were also taken hearing of the said Mass. There was also taken, the same day and hour, for saying Mass at the Lady Gilford's, in Trinity Lane, one Oliver Heywood, priest; and for hearing of the said Mass, the said Lady Gilford, with divers other gentlewomen. There was also taken, at the same instant, in the Lady Brown's house, in Cow Lane, for saying Mass, one Thomas Heywood, priest; and one John Cooper, priest,

* Stat. of the Realm, 13 Eliz. c. 1, 2, and 3.

with the Lady Brown, and divers others, were likewise taken, being hearers of the said Mass. All which persons were, for the same offences, indicted, committed, and had the law according to the statute in that case provided." *

At the very opening of this new era in the persecution, there occurred at Oxford a remarkable circumstance, not to call it a visible judgment. In the Convocation complaints were brought against Roland Jenks, an Oxford bookseller. His house was searched, and papal bulls and "libels" against the queen were found upon the premises. He was sent in irons to London, to be examined by the queen's council. After a subsequent imprisonment for several months in Oxford Castle, he was brought before the judges of the assizes, in the old hall in the castle-yard.†

He was charged with the "high crimes and misdemeanours" of speaking against the queen's religion. Being found guilty, he was condemned to have his ears nailed to a pillory, and there to remain until, by means of a knife which was to be given to him, he had with his own hands disengaged himself. Scarcely was the sentence uttered, when a deadly pestilence fell upon the court, and at once broke up its proceedings. "Though my soul dreads almost to relate it," says the Protestant historian, Wood, "so sudden a plague invaded the men that were present, that you might say death itself sat on the bench. For great numbers immediately dying upon the spot, others, struck with death, hasten out of the court as fast as they could, to die within a few hours." "The persons of greatest

* Stowe.

† Fath. Pars. Ep. De Persecut. ap. Bridgewater's Concertatio, p. 37, Treves, 1588; Wood's Antiq.; Douay Register, an. 1577, ap. Challoner's Miss. Priests, Introduct. Challoner's work being almost entirely a series of direct quotations from contemporary documents accurately quoted (as I have found from verifying many), and being evidently drawn up with a most anxious regard to truth, I shall not scruple to use its quotations as if I were using the works from which they are taken; but I shall annex the title, "Miss. Priests or Mem." to all such references.

note who were seized by that plague, and breathed out their souls, were Sir Robert Bell, chief baron of the Exchequer, and Nicholas Barham, serjeant-at-law, both great enemies of the popish religion; Sir Robert D'Oyley, the high-sheriff of Oxford; Mr. Hart, his deputy; Sir William Babington; Messieurs D'Oyley, Wenman, Danvers, Fellyplace, and Harcourt, justices of the peace; Kirley, Greenwood, Nash, and Foster, gentlemen; to whom are to be joined, to say nothing of others, almost all the jurymen, who died within two days." "Women are not seized by it, nor the poor; neither does any one catch it that takes care of the sick or visits them. But as this disease was strangely violent, so it was but of short continuance, for within a month it was over" (July and Aug. 1577).*

Nothing daunted by this amazing visitation, the agents of the government were busy in all directions, for fear, as Challoner pointedly observes, "the Romans should come and take away their place and nation."

The first priest upon whose traces they fell was Cuthbert Maine, the "Proto-martyr of Douay College." This priest was a native of Barnstable, in Devonshire. His uncle, an aged priest, who had unhappily yielded to the schism, wished to bequeath his own rich benefice to Cuthbert. Being, accordingly, sent to Oxford, the latter won all hearts, both of the Catholics and Protestants, we are told, by his sweet and affable disposition. Whilst at St. John's, he was convinced by some Catholic friends that the new doctrine was heretical, but he had not the energy to abandon his earthly prospects. He took the degree of master of arts, and, perhaps, would never have surrendered to the Divine call, but for a sharp yet most merciful interposition.

Some of his intimate friends were now beyond the sea for conscience' sake. Amongst them were Gregory Martin and Edmund Campion. From the seminary of Douay, these zealous men repeatedly urged Cuth-

* This account, compiled from the authorities last quoted, agrees in its chief substance with that of Stowe (p. 681).

bert to correspond with grace, and join their seminary. One of their letters fell into the hands of the bishop of London, and forthwith a pursuivant made his appearance in the university, and began to seize all that were mentioned in the letter. Cuthbert was, fortunately, absent. He received intelligence of his danger from Ford, a fellow of Trinity College, who himself in due time shed his blood for the faith. Cuthbert immediately slipped into Cornwall, and was soon within the friendly walls of Douay College.*

"Being taken into the Church," says the contemporary manuscript, "falling to divinity, and keeping the private exercises within the house diligently, and doing the public exercises in the schools with commendation, after some years he proceeded bachelor of divinity, and was made priest." Returning to England, to take the consolations of religion to the afflicted Catholics, Cuthbert accepted the hospitality of a Cornish gentleman named Tregian, whose residence was at "Volveden," or "Golden," five miles from Truro (A.D. 1576). Cuthbert passed as Tregian's steward; but not so skilfully as to escape the suspicion of Greenfield, the sheriff of the county.

About midsummer in the following year, the bishop of Exeter was at Truro, on a visitation. Greenfield made known to him his suspicions, and requested his co-operation in searching Tregian's house. The bishop willingly assented; and Greenfield, with the bishop's chancellor, and a large party well armed, made his appearance at Volveden. He had come, he told Tregian, to search for a criminal named Bourne, who had fled from London, and was stated to have taken shelter in Tregian's house. Tregian replied that the man was not there. The sheriff, however, swore that he would search the house. Tregian said that such conduct would be uncourteous, he being a gentleman, and they having no commission. Clutching his dagger, the sheriff rejoined that search the house he would, or else kill or be killed.

* From a MS. written by a friend of Cuthbert, ap. Miss. Priests.

Tregian perceived that violence would be used, and therefore allowed them to enter. They went direct to Cuthbert's room. He was in the garden; but whilst they were furiously beating at the door, came and admitted them. "What art thou?" said Greenwood, seizing him. "I am a man," was the quiet answer. "Have you a coat of mail under your doublet," said the wily and now angry sheriff, tearing it open. "Traitor and rebel," he added, seeing the case of an Agnus-Dei, which he at once seized. Thus, with many an opprobrious epithet, he apprehended him, and carried off his books and papers to the bishop. He was finally imprisoned at Launceston, being heavily ironed, and at the same time chained to his bed.

Amongst his papers was a printed copy of a bull granting a jubilee. He was charged with having procured, and with having published, this bull, and also with having maintained what the indictment styled the "usurped" power of the bishop of Rome; with having denied the queen's supremacy; with having brought into the kingdom an Agnus-Dei, and having given it to Tregian; and, lastly, with having said Mass in Tregian's house.

Although nothing could be distinctly proved, the judge urged upon the jury that strong suspicion was enough. A verdict of guilty was accordingly returned. "*Deo gratias*," answered the intrepid confessor.

On the day appointed for his execution, many justices and others came to see him, bringing with them two of their ministers, to enter upon a controversy. Cuthbert readily encountered them. As usual in such cases, the ministers claimed the victory, and the justices gave out that Cuthbert could produce no Scripture for his assertions. The contrary, however, seems to have been the case: "I know," says a contemporary, "by the report of honest men that were present, that he did confirm every point in question, with testimonies of Scriptures and Fathers; and that abundantly."

Life was offered him if he would only conform to Elizabeth's church. He refused. The offer was pressed upon him again, if he would swear that Elizabeth was supreme head of the Church of England. He now took the proffered Bible into his hands, made the sign of the cross upon it, kissed it, and said, "The queen neither ever was, nor is, nor ever shall be, the head of the Church of England."

The gibbet was unusually high. It was set up in the market-place of Launceston. The martyr approached it undauntedly, and was cast off the ladder, exclaiming, as he struck his breast, "Into thy hands, O Lord, I commend my spirit" (Nov. 29, 1577).

Mr. Tregian, for the same cause, was condemned to perpetual imprisonment, and many of his neighbours and servants became, in the same manner, glorious confessors.*

Two days after the martyrdom of Cuthbert Maine, another priest fell into the toils of the hunters. This was John Nelson, son of Sir Nicholas Nelson, of Shelton, near York.

This heroic man, seeing the spiritual dangers of his poor countrymen, went to Douay, in 1574, in order to study for the priesthood, although he was then nearly forty years of age. He was ordained two years after, at Cambray; and at the end of a few months more returned to England, in order to aid in the work for which he had thus devoted himself. In little more than a year he was discovered, and was tried before the court of High Commission. This court, a real Inquisition, had sprung into existence in the beginning of Elizabeth's reign (A.D. 1564). Its object was to detect and crush all opposition to the newly-established Church of England. In the words of the statute, this inquisitorial tribunal was to discover, "by all ways and means they could devise," erroneous and dangerous opinions, absence from the church by law established, seditious books, libels against the queen

* Apud Chall. Memoirs of Miss. Priests; F. Pars. Ep. de Persecut. ap. Concert.; Allen's Respons. ad Persec. ib. p. 291, *b*.

and her ministers, and, in short, almost every subject of offence that was not already within the jurisdiction of the dreaded Star-chamber, the first of the inquisitorial tribunals of the house of Tudor.

It was before this court that Nelson was now examined. The oath of supremacy was immediately tendered and refused. Asked why he refused, he replied, "Because I have never heard or read that any lay prince could have that pre-eminence." Asked, further, who then was head of the Church, he boldly replied, "The Pope's Holiness, to whom that supreme authority in earth was due, as being Christ's vicar, and the lawful successor of St. Peter."

Being further questioned about "the religion now practised in England," he said it was both "schismatical and heretical." "Whereupon they bid him define what schism was: he told them it was a voluntary departure from the unity of the Catholic Roman faith. Then (seeking to ensnare him) they further urged, 'What is the queen then,—a schismatic or no?' He answered, he could not tell, because he knew not her mind in setting forth, or maintaining of, the religion now publicly used in England. The commissioners replied that the queen did both promulgate it and maintain it; and pressed him to tell them, if she did so, whether, then, she was a schismatic and a heretic or no? Mr. Nelson paused awhile as being unwilling to exasperate his prince, if he might have chosen; but yet more unwilling to offend God and his own conscience, and to give scandal to the world, then he answered, conditionally, If she be the setter forth, said he, and defender of this religion now practised in England, then she is a schismatic and a heretic. Which answer, when they had extorted out of him, they said he had spoken enough, they sought no more at his hands." For by the recent law it was high treason to assert that the queen was a heretic or schismatic.

Being at length condemned "for denying the queen's supremacy," says Stowe, "and other such

traitorous words," he was brought out of prison, and laid upon the hurdle that was to draw him to the place of execution, at Tyburn. The officers that were around told him to ask the queen's forgiveness. "I will ask her no pardon," was his prompt answer, "for I never offended her."

Having arrived at Tyburn, and said some prayers, he thus addressed the people: "I call you all this day to witness that I die in the unity of the Catholic Church; and for that unity do now most willingly suffer my blood to be shed; and, therefore, I beseech God, and request you all to pray for the same, that it would please God, of his great mercy, to make you, and all others that are not such already, true Catholic men: and both to live and die in the unity of our Holy Mother, the Catholic Roman Church."

He "then requested all such as were Catholics to pray with him, that Christ, by the merits of his bitter Passion, would receive his soul into everlasting joy. When the cart was drawn away, a great multitude cried, with a loud voice: 'Lord, receive his soul.'

"He was cut down before he was half dead, and so dismembered and ripped up; and as the hangman plucked out his heart, he lifted himself up a little, and, as some that stood near report, spoke these words, 'I forgive the queen, and all that were causers of my death:' but I, though I saw his lips move, yet heard not so much: and the hangman had three or four blows at his head before he could strike it off." *

Whilst thus hunting to death the devoted priests, the government sought to profit by the terror into which it had thrown the whole body of Catholics. Could it now but succeed in crushing the Douay seminary (which already counted a hundred and fifty members, and had sent into England fifty-two priests), the discouragement of the Catholics might be so complete, as to hinder them from recommencing the attempt. Such appears to have been its calculation:

* Chall.'s Mem.; Allen's Reply, p. 292; Stowe, A.D. 1578.

it soon found that the heroic band might die, but would never yield.

Requesens, governor of the Netherlands, was promised on the part of Elizabeth, that if he suppressed the seminary, the fleet of those Netherlanders that were in arms against his master, the king of Spain, should not be allowed to enter the ports of England. He consented, and Dr. Cardinal Allen saw a work which had cost so much toil, but which was now assuming every appearance of stability, suddenly demolished (A.D. 1578). He was, however, speedily consoled. The Jesuits offered him a shelter in their house at Pont à Musson; while the zealous and much-maligned princes of the house of Guise pressed upon him their hospitality. The cardinal accepted the kindness of the latter. Under their liberal patronage, the seminary arose as vigorous as ever, in the far-famed city of Rheims. Even here the vengeance of Elizabeth attempted to smite them. The king of France, however, refused to imitate the mean policy of Requesens; and the seminary continued to thrive, and to send into England, under various disguises, a considerable number of missionary priests.*

Amongst the rest, was Everard Hanse. Born in Northamptonshire, and educated at Cambridge, he had, at last, obtained a rich benefice. His reflections during a time of sickness, led him to the resolution of becoming reconciled to the only true Church. Having accomplished his purpose, and studied for a time at Rheims, he was made priest on the 25th of March, 1581. In about a month, he returned to England, and whilst visiting some prisoners in the Marshalsea, was suspected and seized.

He boldly avowed himself both a Catholic and a priest. "Then," said the recorder, who examined him, "you are a subject to the Pope?" "So I am, sir," was the reply. "Then the Pope hath some superiority over you?" "That is true." "What, in

* Bridgewater; More; Camd. an. 1580, p. 314.

England?" "Yea, in England," returned Hanse; "for he hath as much authority and right in spiritual government in this realm, as ever he had; and as much as he hath in any other country, or in Rome itself."

They "asked him further whether he thought the Pope could not err." He replied, "that in life and manners he might offend, as also err in his private doctrine or writing; but that in judicial definitions, and in deciding matters of controversy, he did never err."

Then they proceeded with him further, and demanded "whether the Pope had not judicially proceeded in the deposition of the queen . . . . Did he not err," said they, "in this?" "I hope," said Mr. Hanse, "he did not."

After some other questions, an indictment was drawn up, charging Hanse, amongst other things, with being made priest beyond the seas, with having returned to seduce the queen's subjects from their obedience, and with having declared that the Pope did not err in excommunicating and deposing Elizabeth.

Being condemned, and drawn to Tyburn (July 31, 1581), he was asked whether he considered Elizabeth to be his sovereign. He answered that he "did take her for his queen; and that he had never offended her majesty otherwise than in matters of his conscience, which their new-made statutes had drawn to matters of treason. And whereas," said he, "I understand it has been given out, that I should say treason was no offence to God, I protest I neither meant nor said any more but that these new-made treasons, which are nothing else, indeed, but the confession of the Catholic points of religion, were no offences to God."

"Then the ministers called upon him to pray with them, and to desire the people to assist him. He answered that he might not pray with heretics; but desired humbly all Catholics to pray for him and with him. And so, whilst he was praying devoutly to himself, the cart was drawn away; and before he was

half dead, the rope was cut, and he bowelled alive, and afterwards quartered: a spectacle of great edification to the good, and a wonder to every one that looked upon it."*

Whilst the superiors of the college at Rheims were consoled by the heroism of their missionaries, they were scarcely less consoled within their own walls, by the general zeal for its discipline, and a spirit of retirement, study, and prayer. Even amongst themselves, however, they experienced some of the trials that spring up perpetually along the path of life.

There was at Rheims a student named Richard Baines. This young man in due course was ordained priest, and for some time remained as a professor. He had not, however, given his whole heart to God. It was given, in part at least, to the pleasures and honours of the world. This state of mind and its consequences he himself afterwards publicly confessed.

He indulged in dreams of the comfortable life of those that were enjoying the benefices from which they had expelled the Catholic clergy, and he yielded up his soul to an intense desire of sharing in their ease and riches. To a man thus wedded to earth, how tedious and bitter must have been the exercises of a college, every one of which tended more or less to wean the soul from the earth, and to train and harden it for a warfare to the death against the triple enemy. Richard still, however, conformed himself externally to rule; but whilst he appeared to his superiors to be engaged in the usual study of the Holy Scriptures and Fathers, he was devouring the profane writers, those especially that either cared little for religion or directly attacked it. A keen observer might have

* Apud Chall. Miss. Priests. The reports from which the extracts in the text have been selected are evidently exact, even to scrupulosity. The authority is, generally, an eye-witness. What he does not see with his own eyes, or hear with his own ears, he states cautiously, either as a report, or as a statement made by trustworthy witnesses. Camden, on the other hand, whose chief, if not sole, resources were in the State paper offices, has evidently founded his account of Catholic transactions upon distorted narratives (see p. 199).

suspected that all was not as it should be, for his lectures abounded far less with sound instruction than with smart facetious sayings, and studied turns of expression.

His intercourse was chiefly with the younger students, and from his sarcastic remarks upon superiors, it became a means of weakening the proper feeling of deference, and in some degree of destroying subordination. With the elders of the college he affected a tone of great simplicity, so as to disarm suspicion, and yet to probe the most important secrets of the house. His object was to make this knowledge, on his return to England, a means of securing its coveted honours and riches.

What he thus allowed to take root in his inmost soul, could not long be prevented from betraying itself in his conversation. He began to speak slightingly of prayer and fasting, and other observances of Holy Church. Before those unthinking youths whom he admitted to an intimacy, he was but too open on such matters; he managed to procure them meat in his room on Friday evenings, and, what was worse, dared even to breathe poisonous words upon the most delicate of virtues, holy purity. The havoc such a Judas might have made was checked by God's mercy.

His own restless desires removed him from the college. Under pretence of zeal, he asked leave to go as a missionary into England. Some of his expressions against religion had reached the ears of his superiors; but whether they thought him to be merely exercising his talents of controversy, or considered it a less evil to send him upon the mission than to retain a suspected character, they granted him the required permission.

God's mercy, meantime, did not forsake this poor prodigal. Instead of what an excited imagination had depicted, he soon experienced the inconvenience and horror of a dungeon (May, 1583). His sufferings opened his eyes; he saw the miserable condition of his soul, and he hardened not his heart. He returned

to the college humble and penitent, and by a public confession and exemplary conduct endeavoured to repair the scandal which he had given.*

Whilst the Catholics were watching with almost breathless interest the struggles of the Douay seminary, and its emigration to Rheims, some of them began to think, that as all resources were needed, they ought to implore the generous Pontiff to grant them some place of education at Rome. A few houses near St. Peter's were promptly assigned for this purpose, and were soon converted into an infant seminary (A.D. 1578). To secure for it a permanent maintenance, it was thought some use might be made of the English hospital at Rome. This hospital had been founded in the fourteenth century, for the service of the numerous English pilgrims. It consisted originally of two establishments, the one under the name of St. Edmund's, and the other under that of the Holy Trinity and St. Thomas of Canterbury.† Could this united hospital be made available as a seminary, it promised greater security from the tumult of war than either Belgium or France. Such, it appears, was the idea that arose in the mind of Owen Lewis, a native of Wales, who during his exile for the faith had been created archdeacon of Cambray. Being "Referendary of the Apostolic Chamber," he made known his desire to Gregory XIII.

The Pope immediately embraced the suggestion. He added considerably to the slender revenues of the English hospital, and, still leaving open its gates to

* See his confession in Bridgw. Concert. p. 238.

† It has been generally thought that this hospital sprang from the school established by King Ina. Tierney, however, has shown from various authorities, and especially from the documents of the hospital itself, that it had no connection with the Saxon school (which, indeed, was extinct).—(See his Dodd, vol. ii. p. 168.) It would appear that the original school soon became the centre around which were grouped the dwellings of the English: it was the English quarter of the city; such, at least, would seem to be the meaning of Anastasius, where, speaking of a conflagration at Rome, he mentions as being consumed, "omnis illorum habitatio, quæ in eorum linguâ burgus dicitur," &c.—St. Paschal, about A.D. 820.

poor pilgrims, changed it, or rather at first only a portion of it, into a seminary. The bull of foundation is dated April 23, 1579, but was not published until the close of the following year.

Its reconstruction was intrusted to Cardinal Morone, who was nominated its protector. Morone, by the advice of Persons, the English Jesuit, called Allen to his assistance, and Maurice Clenock, a native of Wales, and bishop-elect of Bangor in the reign of Mary, was nominated rector.

The new establishment was too well adapted to the good of the Church to escape the attacks of the Evil One. As the college contained seven Welsh and thirty-three English subjects, Dr. Clenock, himself a native of Wales, needed both tact and firmness. Whether he possessed these essential qualities or not, the English soon began to complain of his partiality to the Welsh. Their complaints to the cardinal-protector being unavailing, they presented to the Pope, by the hands of Beanchetti, the Pope's chamberlain, a petition for redress. Had they done this and yet observed respect and obedience towards Clenock, they would of course escape all imputation. In their vehemence, however, some of them refused to acknowledge Clenock to be their rector. The final result of all their efforts was therefore a command to obey or to quit the city. They resolved upon the latter alternative; and, quitting the seminary, prepared to return home. As soon as this became known, a strong sympathy began to display itself in their favour, and even Dr. Lewis, who was not unwilling to witness the expulsion of a few, could not, if we may credit his own words, endure the sight of twenty youths (so he counted them) travelling home penniless and outcast, a scandal to the Catholic world, and an object of ridicule to the heretics.*

* See Bullar., and compare the letters (apud Dodd) of Dr. Lewis and of Mr. Haddock, one of the English students, addressed to Dr. Allen. Haddock writes with all the warmth of youth, and it would also appear with all its sincerity. Dr. Allen's reply on the appointment of Jesuits, at the desire of the English students, is worthy of

He applied, therefore, to the Pope, and the final result was the removal of Dr. Clenock, and at the request of many of the students, the appointment of a Jesuit as president of the English college.

the zeal and charity of such a man. (See also Tierney's corrections of Dodd, vol. ii. pp. 167—176, &c.; More's Hist. Miss. Angl. Soc. Jesu. lib. ii. No. 23, &c. St. Omer's, 1660.) More was born in Essex in 1586, became a Jesuit at Louvain, and was for many years chaplain in the family of the Petres. Towards 1640 he suffered imprisonment for the faith.—(See Dr. Oliver's Coll.) He can scarcely be called a contemporary of any part of the sixteenth century; but has embodied in his history various documents of that period. He is a rugged but conscientious writer. It is to be lamented that he did not describe more completely the state of the English mission. Yet such an extension, it must be admitted, would be rather exceeding his task, which was a history of the mission as far only as regarded the Jesuits.

CHAPTER XIII.

DESIRE OF ST. IGNATIUS TO ASSIST ENGLAND — CAMPION AND PERSONS—ALLEN'S REQUEST THAT JESUITS MAY BE SENT TO ENGLAND—CONVERSATION OF CAMPION AND ALLEN—ARRIVAL OF CAMPION AND PERSONS IN LONDON—THEIR LABOURS—CONFERENCE AND DECISION REGARDING ATTENDANCE AT CHURCH—PERILS—ARREST OF CAMPION AND OTHERS—A PRETENDED PLOT—TRIALS AND EXECUTIONS.

THE founder of the illustrious Society of Jesus, St. Ignatius of Loyola, had observed with deep interest the trials of the Church in England and Ireland, and had urged Cardinal Pole to send him young men who might be useful for saving the souls of their countrymen. He had now been dead five-and-twenty years, and his religious had already become numerous and influential enough to found colleges in almost every part of Europe, and to establish missions amongst the most distant and barbarous nations. As yet, however, the plans of St. Ignatius and his successors for England's salvation had been constantly baffled. Unable to act, they had recourse to prayer, and the fruit of their prayers was now approaching maturity.*

Touched by the devoted zeal of this saintly and learned institution, several Englishmen entered its noviciate, and embraced its self-denying rules. Amongst these were Edmund Campion and Robert Persons.

The latter was born at Nether Stowey, in Somersetshire. Having become master of arts in Baliol College, and having twice taken the oath of abjuration of

* See the ep. to Pole, in More's Hist. Miss. Ang. p. 12, St. Omer's, 1660.

the Pope's supremacy, he was so troubled in conscience, and so fearful of not having firmness enough to withstand further trials, that he withdrew from the university. Returning, however, he experienced so much vexatious annoyance from the proctor, and from Christopher Bageshawe, one of his fellow collegians, that he again forsook the place. If, indeed, we can believe Camden,* who is very bitter against him, he was even expelled. He at first settled at Padua, as a medical student, but soon went to Rome, and entered the society of the Jesuits (A.D. 1575).

Campion was a native of London. He was educated at St. John's College, Oxford. He was a great favourite with its founder, Sir Thomas White. Indeed he was, as Camden avows, so "highly courteous and refined," that he was universally loved. Pressed by his friends, he not only remained at the university in the midst of Elizabeth's changes, becoming its junior proctor, but received deacon's orders according to the new rite.

After further progress in study, he went to Ireland, and wrote its history. How much this work was esteemed by Protestant contemporaries will best appear from the words of Holingshed: "I resolved to make shift to frame a special history of Ireland, in

* There are two causes of Camden's inaccuracies—his vouchers and his party spirit. His vouchers, the state papers, are frequently the writings of incensed statesmen and judges, and the accusations of paid informers. Let his account, or that of the state trials, be compared with the Memoirs of Missionary Priests, and the more general accuracy and more invariable love of truth in the latter will be undeniable.

In the case of Maine, Nelson, and Hanse, Camden's party spirit made him forget, at times, that the historian, as such, is a man of no country, of no faction, and of no earthly interests. He says that Maine, Nelson, Hanse, and Sherwood (a Douay scholar who was martyred), endeavoured, "it was found," to excite sedition "under the seal of confession," and, enforcing the declaratory bull of Pius V., made rebellion against Elizabeth the condition of any reconciliation with the Church.—(Camd. Ann. an. 1580, p. 315.) For such a statement some voucher should have been produced. Camden has none.

like manner as I had done of other regions, following Campion's order, and setting down his own words, except in places where I had matter to enlarge that (out of other authors) which he had written in brief. And this I have thought good to signify, the rather for that I esteem it good dealing in no wise to defraud him of his due deserved praise."

This accomplished scholar, having been reconciled to the Church, studied theology for some time, at the new college at Douay. To atone for having received "that schismatical deaconship," he went to Rome, and requested admission into the order of the Jesuits (A.D. 1573). His request was granted; and after a month's stay, he was sent into Bohemia, where he remained seven years. He was ordained priest at Prague. His great talents for preaching, and for converting heretics, soon attracted universal attention. It was this wide-spread reputation, it would appear, that made Dr. Allen long for such a missioner for England. At all events, eaten up with the zeal for souls, Allen, in October, 1579, presented himself before the Pope, and entreated that the English Jesuits might be sent to labour amongst their own countrymen. His request was speedily granted, and the general of the order despatched Campion and Persons (the latter as superior) to labour amongst the benighted English; strictly enjoining them never either directly or indirectly to interfere in politics. Like true religious men, they at once obeyed.

On their way to their appointed mission, they called at Rheims. Campion there asked Dr. Allen whether any service he could do in England would be worth the risk and toil, or would compensate for his absence from Bohemia. "'Father,' said Dr. Allen, 'first, whatever you did there may be done by others, one or more of your order; secondly, you owe more duty to England than to Bohemia, and to London than to Prague,—though I am glad you have made some recompense to that country for the old wound it

received from us in Wickliffe's time, from whom the Hussites of Bohemia learned their heresies; thirdly, the recovery of one soul from heresy is worth all your pains, as I hope you will gain many, because the harvest is both more plentiful and more ripe with us than in those parts; finally, the reward may be greater, for you may be martyred for it at home, which you cannot easily obtain there.' So he was satisfied; and of this communication I have heard him often speak."

As there was risk of being seized on their very landing, they crossed the Straits of Dover separately. A little before embarking, Campion wrote to Mercurianus a letter breathing cheerfulness and courage. "The battle is with ignorance and sin; I will begin it or die. Oftentimes the van is crushed when the army itself is victorious."

As soon as he had landed at Dover, dressed, as he himself stated on his trial, in a buff jerkin and velvet jacket, he was suspected and detained. He implored the intercession of St. John the Baptist, to whom he had an especial devotion; and by his prayers, as he himself always loved to think, he was in a few hours released (A.D. 1580).

He found a considerable number of young noblemen assembled in some place in London to greet his arrival. The veneration displayed by the faithful was everywhere almost incredible. He preached for the first time on the feast of SS. Peter and Paul; at which, says the writer of his life, "I myself was present;" and at which, notwithstanding the rigour of the laws, there was "a full audience, and that of persons of distinction." He preached at least once, and sometimes even three times, a day. Many of his sermons, especially those on the Hail Mary, the Ten Lepers, the Last Judgment, and the parable of the king going into a far country, were long handed down as some of the most precious of the traditions of the North. It was no uncommon thing for men of rank to lodge for the

night in barns, in order to be in time for Father Campion's discourses. Such was the fruit of his sermons, that he ventured to recommend to the general of his order that the Jesuits appointed to England should always be "able preachers." *

The eagerness with which the Catholics thronged to Father Campion could not long escape notice. The Protestants became aware of his presence in the capital, and were soon in pursuit. Father Persons now arrived from the country (disguised as a soldier of no ordinary self-importance), and counselled a removal from town. Before this took place, a meeting of the neighbouring priests was contrived. One object was to obtain uniformity with regard to festivals and fasting-days. Some of the priests having been ordained before the accession of Elizabeth, were accustomed to the old English observances; others ordained more recently knew only the more mitigated customs of the various countries in which they had been educated. Even in England itself the discipline was not everywhere the same.

To obviate all difficulties, it was agreed that each priest, as soon as he moved into a different part of the country, should ascertain the customs of that part, and to such customs should strictly adhere.

Another point of discussion was, whether any reason could render it lawful to obey the law of attendance at the Protestant service. It was decided that none could render it lawful. The following were the principal reasons for this decision: that service was made, in order to thrust out the old Catholic rites; that attendance in the mind of the law and the intention of the lawgiver, was interpreted as conformity, and such an interpretation outweighed all private reasons. If even it were lawful, there was great danger that such attendance would gradually produce indifference, and then full participation in the guilt of schism and heresy.

* Ap. Challoner's Mem. Camp. Letters; ap. More's Hist. Miss. Ang. Soc. lib. iii.; Oliver's Collections (Campion and Persons).

After this meeting, both Persons and Campion hastened into the country, the former labouring in Northamptonshire, Gloucestershire, Herefordshire, and Derbyshire, and the latter in the more northern counties.*

Campion had put into the hands of a friend a little treatise, not to be published unless he himself were captured. It announced the object of his coming, and challenged the Protestants to a public discussion. By this means, he hoped to aid in upholding the Catholic Church in England, even if he happened, by an early arrest, to be debarred the ordinary exercise of his priestly functions. The friend, however, to whom he had confided the document, betrayed his trust by almost at once publishing it. This precipitate step induced Father Campion to publish the elegant and closely-reasoned work, entitled the "Ten Reasons," and addressed to the two universities.

Some pamphlets appeared in answer, with more or less cogency, and overflowing with calumnies against the Jesuits. But the power chiefly invoked by the Protestant ministers, and especially when Persons had written his "Reasons for not going to Church," was that of the prison and the gibbet. Alarming rumours were meantime set afloat; and speeches by men who ought to know the truth, no less than the pamphlets already mentioned, gave form and colour to these vague reports, and royal proclamations stimulated men's awakened apprehensions. The Jesuits and the seminary priests had come into England (so said even the queen) to urge on domestic treason, and prepare for the success of a foreign invasion.†

* More, lib. iii. Allen's strenuous exertions to hinder attendance at church have been already stated (p. 177). In 1578, Allen's learned friend, Dr. Gregory Martin, published "A Treatise on Schism; showing that all Catholics ought, in any wise, to abstain altogether from heretical conventicles, to wit, their prayers, sermons," &c. Douay, 1578.

† Camden assigns June, 1580, as the date of this edict. Elizabeth herself, however, when issuing another proclamation, states that the one in the text was "given in the palace at Westminster, on the

The repetition of informers' tales, and the stir of constant search, gave to this fabrication an appearance of reality. For many weeks, however, the efforts of the pursuivants were fruitless. Some priests, indeed, were captured, and the earl of Southampton and the lords Paget, Compton, and Vaux, and many of the gentry, were thrust into prison; but Father Campion, or as he was popularly termed the Pope's Champion, was nowhere to be found. He lived, however, in the midst of alarms. "We cannot," he wrote to Mercurianus, "long escape the hands of the heretics; so many are the eyes of our enemies, so many their tongues, so many their snares." He wore a dress as opposite as possible to his religious character; but even this disguise he had constantly to change. He heard on all sides the hue and cry after himself; and sometimes was himself told of Campion's having been seized. He contrived, however, to visit what he himself calls "a good part of the island." Whilst thus fulfilling all the duties of an apostle, he found his toils and anxieties repaid with overflowing consolations.

Equally great were the labours, and equally great the consolations, of Father Persons. Describing his occupations in one of his letters to Rome, from dawn of day till far in the night, he said, besides Mass and sometimes two sermons, there is incessant business (Dec. 1580). I have to reply to questions of conscience, to send priests to opportune places, to receive persons returning to the Church, to confirm by letters those that are wavering, and to assist by alms those that are in prison. I should altogether despond, were not the work so clearly for God's glory, and were not the joy so great that congratulates our arrival. The persecution, as the same epistle testifies, was raging in all directions: everywhere arrests and

10th of January, in the twenty-third year of her most fortunate reign." As the years of her reign date from the 17th November, 1558, January in the twenty-third year must have been January, 1581.

confiscations, yet almost everywhere incredible ardour and constancy.

Again repairing to London, the two fathers often met at Harrow-on-the-Hill. They sometimes walked together; and when they passed the place of execution at Tyburn, Campion always took off his hat, in reverence to the martyrs who had there laid down their lives.

The search after them meantime was hot, and often close at hand. The printing-press which a Catholic gentleman had put at their disposal, now fell into the hands of the pursuivants: it was high time to leave the capital. Campion was again to repair to the North; but his last combat was now awaiting him.

He had repaired to the house of a Mr. Yates, at Lyford, in Berkshire, eight miles from Oxford, when George Elliott, a man in the pay of Walsingham, having found admittance to Mass, having been himself a Catholic, discovered that no less a prize than Campion himself was within his grasp. Having extracted as much information as possible, he withdrew; but speedily returned with a party of soldiers. Their search was for a long time fruitless; but Elliott running to and fro, and trying every wall with a mallet, stumbled at last upon the closet where Campion lay concealed. This closet appears to have been just large enough for a bed, upon which Campion and two other priests were found lying, "with their faces and hands lifted up to heaven." He had offered to surrender himself, in order to save his companions; but they with equal magnanimity had refused to hear of it.

Being thus taken, he was conducted with all possible display through the most crowded part of London. There was no mistaking who he was; for, by orders of the council, a paper had been fixed upon his hat, with the words in conspicuous characters: "Campion, the seditious Jesuit" (July, 1581).

He was, finally, lodged in the Tower. After "sundry examinations, terrors, and threats by the Lord Chancellor and others of the council and commission, he

was divers times racked, to force out of him by intolerable torments whose houses he had frequented, by whom he was relieved, whom he had reconciled, when, which way, for what purpose, and by what commission, he came into the realm; how, where, and by whom he printed and dispersed his books, and such like."

At the entrance of the torture-chamber, he always fell upon his knees to implore the help of God, and when distended upon the rack, with his joints violently wrested from their sockets, he continually prayed and invoked the holy name, Jesus.

Once only did he show some want of firmness (if indeed, we may so judge him). The commissioners swore that if he told the names of some persons with whom he had been, no harm should fall upon them. If not, Campion ought to have reasoned, why were the commissioners so anxious about them; and ought to have remained silent, for fear of exposing the innocent to suffering. Being, however, himself of an amiable turn of mind, and hearing their solemn protestation, he revealed the names of several.

During the course of these torturings, the public were, as usual in all such cases, deluded with a variety of false rumours. At one time, there was great hope, so it was busily circulated, that he would become a Protestant. At another, he had actually been at church. Now he was confessing everything asked of him; and now he had committed suicide. Had he died of his torments, this last rumour would, no doubt, have been still more authoritatively announced. It was not an uncommon expedient.

Having passed four months in this manner, he was put on his trial at the Queen's Bench. He found himself arraigned in company with fourteen others, of whom twelve were priests. They were charged with high treason, for having sought the deposition and death of the queen, and "the overthrow of the religion now professed in England, as well as the invasion of the realm." The very time and place of the pretended

plot were stated. It was at Rheims, and Rome, and "elsewhere," during March and April, in 1581, that they arranged the scheme; and it was on the 8th of May that they began their journey from Rheims to seduce the queen's subjects from their duties and allegiance to her highness, and allure them to "the Romish religion, and obedience to the Pope."

When pleading not guilty, Campion thus addressed the court: "I protest before God and his holy angels, before heaven and earth, before the world and this bar whereat I stand, which is but a small resemblance of the terrible judgment of the next life, that I am not guilty of any part of the treason contained in the indictment, or of any other treason whatsoever. Is it possible to find twelve men so wicked and void of all conscience in this city or land, that will find us guilty together of this one crime, divers of us never meeting or knowing one the other before our bringing to this bar?"

Campion objected at the same time to the promiscuous trial of so many different persons: it would, he justly argued, produce confusion in the minds of a wise and experienced jury. "They may take the evidence against one to be against all, and consequently the crime of the one for the crime of the other." When Anderson, the queen's counsel, in a highly-wrought declamatory speech, had endeavoured, but without any clear proof, to fix upon them the charge of treason, they stood amazed at his vehemence and assurance; and when he had finished, Campion asked whether he was there "as an orator to accuse them, or a pleader to give in evidence;" and, in a cogent lively address, exposed the fallacy of his charges, and the cruelty of producing alleged probabilities as proofs.

After a variety of remarks, questions, and replies, J. Caddy, alias Cradocke, was produced as a witness. Yet his statement of two hundred priests coming to preach, and an army coming from the Pope, was, after all, but hearsay. The queen's counsel, however, as if

Caddy had made no declaration that he had merely heard what he stated, pressed the charges, and added a variety of others totally irrelevant to the trial. Baffled by the prompt and cheerful replies of Campion, he lost his temper; "If here," he said, "as you do in schools, you bring in your minor and conclusions, you will prove a fool; but minor or conclusion, I will bring it to a purpose anon." He afterwards taunted Campion with having at his examinations returned answers so evasive, that they argued a guilty conscience. In reply to this, the fearless confessor stated that when questioned whether the Pope might lawfully excommunicate the queen, his answer was that he was "an insufficient umpire between her majesty and the Pope for so high a controversy, whereof neither the certainty is as yet known, nor the best divines in Christendom stand fully resolved. Albeit I thought that if the Pope should do it, yet it might be insufficient, for it is agreed *clavis errare potest;* but the divines of the Catholic Church do distinguish of the Pope's authority, attributing unto him ordination and inordination: potestatem ordinatim, whereby he proceedeth in matters purely spiritual and pertinent to the Church, and by that he cannot excommunicate any prince or potentate; inordination, when he passeth by order of law, as by appeals and such like, and so, as some think, he may excommunicate and depose princes. These matters be merely spiritual points of doctrine disputable in schools, no part of mine indictment, not to be given in evidence, and unfit to be discussed at the King's Bench. To conclude, they are no matters of fact; they be not in the trial of the country, the jury ought not to take any notice of them;" although "very discreet men, they are unfit judges to decide so deep a question."

When now the trial was drawing to a close, one of the justices said to the jurors: all the matter resteth in this, whether to believe the prisoners that speak for their lives, or the witnesses that come freely to depose as they are demanded; the witnesses affirm sufficient

proof against them; they deny whatsoever is alleged. This was a palpable hint. Campion, therefore, briefly recapitulated what had been said; and urged upon the jury the want both of proofs in the allegations, and of character in the witnesses.

The intention to make away with the accused was so evident, that three gentlemen of property who had been impanelled, absented themselves, we are told, upon this ground alone; and that the attorney-general, when the mockery of a trial was drawing to a close, did not scruple to declare that it was the queen's resolve that they should die. It was no matter that the lawyers in court, while the jury were deliberating, unanimously concurred, speculating upon the verdict, that Father Campion could not be found guilty. It was to no purpose, as far as the other prisoners were concerned, that one of them, Colleton, otherwise Collington, was proved, even to the admission of the court, to have been in London at the time the charge stated him to have been at Rheims. Colleton was, indeed, released (though afterwards banished), but, as if the charge was in no manner shaken, the verdict returned for all the rest, after an hour's consultation, was that all were guilty. When the foreman of the jury had made this announcement, the lord chief justice exclaimed: "Campion and the rest, what have you to say that you should not die?" Campion thus replied: "It was not our death that ever we feared. We knew that we were not lords of our own lives, and for want of answer would not be guilty of our own deaths. The only thing that we have now to say is, that if our religion do make us traitors, we are worthy to be condemned; but, otherwise, are and have been as true subjects as ever the queen had any."

The fatal black cap was now upon the judge's brow, and the sentence was slowly uttered in all its startling distinctness. To the condemned all this was not without effect, but it was an effect quite unexpected by the court. Their joy was so great, that they could not restrain it:—"*Te Deum laudamus*," exclaimed

Campion; whilst Sherwine cried aloud: "This is the day which the Lord hath made; let us triumph and rejoice therein." The joy of all was the same; and so striking, so unaffected, that the dense crowd around was thrown into a general feeling of astonishment and sympathy.

Of this little band of martyrs, Fathers Campion, Sherwine, and Brian, were the first to be led to execution. Arrived at the foot of the gibbet, Campion began to address the people upon that text of St. Paul: "We are a spectacle to the world." He was interrupted by the officers, and bid to confess himself guilty. "For the treasons which have been laid to my charge, and I am come here to suffer for, I desire you all to bear witness with me, that thereof I am altogether innocent."

Whereupon answer was made to him by one of the counsel, that he might not seem to deny the objections against him, having been proved by sufficient evidence. "Well, my lord," said he, "I am a Catholic man and a priest: in that faith have I lived, and in that faith do I intend to die; and if you esteem my religion treason, then am I guilty. As for any other treason, I never committed, God is my judge; but you have now what you desire. I beseech you to have patience, and suffer me to speak a word or two for discharge of my conscience."

"But not being suffered to go forward, he was forced to speak only to that point which they most urged, protesting that he was innocent of all treason and conspiracy; desiring credit to be given to his answers, as to the last answer made upon his death and soul, adding, that the jury might easily be deceived, but that he forgave all, as he desired to be forgiven; desiring all them to forgive him whose names he had confessed upon the rack."

He added that certain "secrets," to which he had referred in a letter, "were not, as it was misconstrued by the enemy, treason or conspiracy, or any matter else against her majesty or the state, but saying of

mass, hearing confessions, preaching, and such-like duties and functions of priesthood. This he protested to be true, as he would answer before God.

"Asked to give his opinion respecting the Pope's excommunication of Elizabeth, he remained silent. Asked whether he renounced the Pope, he replied, 'I am a Catholic;' whereupon one inferred, saying, 'In your Catholicism [I noted the term] all treason is contained.'"

Having requested all Catholic bystanders to unite with him, he began to pray. He was admonished to pray in English. "I shall pray in a language I well understand," he answered. "At the upshot of this conflict he was told to ask the queen's forgiveness, and to pray for her. He meekly answered, 'Wherein have I offended her? In this I am innocent: this is my last speech; in this give me credit: I have and do pray for her.' Then the Lord Charles Howard asked of him for which queen he prayed, whether for Elizabeth the queen? To whom he answered, 'Yea, for Elizabeth, your queen and my queen.' And the cart being drawn away, he meekly and sweetly yielded his soul unto his Saviour, protesting that he died a perfect Catholic." *

When the butchery of Campion's body was finished, it came to the turn of his companions: "The hangman, taking hold of Mr. Sherwine, with his hands all bloody, said to him, thinking to terrify him, 'Come, Sherwine, take thou also thy wages.' But the holy man, nothing dismayed, embraced him with a cheerful countenance, and reverently kissed the blood that stuck to his hands; at which the people were very much moved."

Finding that a speech was expected from him, he declared his innocence, with a loud courageous voice,

* From the eye-witness cited by Chall. (Mem. Miss. Priests). See also letters of Persons and Camp. in More or in Camp.'s works, a small collection of which (a revised edition) was published at Antwerp, 1631; Camd. 1580, p. 316, &c.; State Trials (from Cott. MSS.), vol. i. p. 1050.

adding, that "although, in this short time of mortal life, he was to undergo the infamy and punishment of a traitor, he made no doubt of his future happiness, through Jesus Christ, in whose death, passion, and blood he only trusted."

Being interrupted for the second time by Sir Francis Knowles, he said, "Tush, tush! you and I shall answer this before another judge, where my innocence shall be known, and you will see that I am guiltless of this." To another remark he answered, "If to be a Catholic only, if to be a perfect Catholic, be to be a traitor, then am I traitor."

Thus firmly, and even cheerfully, did he give his body to death, exclaiming, as the cart passed away,—"Jesu! Jesu! Jesu! be to me a Jesus!"

With equal courage did Brian, their companion, finish his martyrdom * (Dec. 1, 1581).

The following year saw the death of one who had entered upon the English mission in company with its proto-martyr, Cuthbert Maine. This was John Paine, a native of Northamptonshire. He was seized in 1581, kept "long in prison, very ill used, cruelly handled, and extremely racked." In this state he was asked, whether he would go to their church. "Why," said he, "you say I am in for treason; discharge me of that, and then you shall know farther of my mind for the other." Being at length brought to trial, he was charged, on the information of one Elliott, with being privy to a design to assassinate Elizabeth, and proclaim the queen of Scots. To the oath of this informer, "Mr. Morrice, the queen's counsellor, joined several presumptions from Mr. Paine's having gone beyond the seas, and having been made priest by the bishop of Cambray, and consequently, as he falsely supposed, having taken an oath to the Pope; from his having spoken with traitors in Flanders, viz., with the earl of Westmoreland, Dr. Allen, and Dr. Bristow; and travelled with a traitor's son, Mr. William Tempest."

* Chall. (the same eye-witness).

"To these presumptions, Mr. Paine answered, that to go beyond the seas was not a sufficient token of a traitor, nor yet to be made priest by the bishop of Cambray; for so were many others not at all thinking of treason; that, for his part, he was not the Pope's scholar, neither had any maintenance of him, for when he was at the college it had as yet no pension from the Pope. That he had never talked with the earl of Westmoreland; and that Dr. Allen and Dr. Bristow had never talked to his knowledge of any such things; that Mr. Tempest was an honourable gentleman, and never talked to him about treason; neither was it unlawful for him to keep him company, seeing that he was a servant to a right honourable counsellor, Sir Christopher Hatton."

The conversation with Elliott he solemnly denied; the very character of Elliott he objected to as publicly infamous; and he appealed both to Scripture and to the statute, "that without two sufficient witnesses no man should be condemned." He was, notwithstanding, found guilty. Asked, as usual, what he had to say why sentence should not be pronounced against him, he replied that "he had said sufficiently;" "that it was against the law of God and man that he should be condemned for one man's witness notoriously infamous."

The law to which he thus appealed was that of Edward VI., by which two witnesses were required for a proof of high treason. Heedless of all but the wishes of the government, Gaudy, the judge, replied, that if he were not guilty, the jury would have found it. "Those men of the jury," remonstrated Paine, "are poor ignorant men, not at all understanding what treason is. But, if it please the queen and her council that I shall die, I refer my cause to God."

After some other remarks on both sides, the sentence was pronounced. Two days after, Paine was led to execution. He was condemned, and suffered at Chelmsford (April 2, 1582). When he reached the gallows, "he kissed it with a smiling countenance,

and ascended the ladder." "Very meekly, when the ladder was about to be turned, he said, 'Jesus! Jesus! Jesus!' and so did hang, not moving hand or foot. . . All the town loved him exceedingly, so did the keepers and most of the magistrates of the shire." *

* Apud Chall.'s Miss. Priests. This life, too, was written by an eye-witness.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE SIX ARTICLES—ELIZABETH'S PROCLAMATIONS AGAINST THE MISSIONARY PRIESTS—ALLEN'S DEFENCE OR APOLOGY—HIS "REPLY" TO THE EXECUTION OF JUSTICE—CONFUSION IN THE CHURCH-BY-LAW-ESTABLISHED—THE THREE ARTICLES, A TEST OF UNIFORMITY.

It was manifest to all reflecting men, that in the trials and executions of the missionary priests the government had failed to bring home its charge of high treason. The surviving priests who had been condemned along with Campion for the pretended conspiracy at Rheims and Rome, were detained in prison for several months. There seems to be no satisfactory means of accounting for this delay, but the perplexity of the government. It knew how strong a feeling there was in favour of the condemned, and yet it was determined, although it knew not how, to brand them afresh with treason.

It devised at last a notable expedient. An instrument was drawn up in six heads or articles, and the answers to these being taken in writing by four lawyers, it would be no difficult matter, so it was thought, to entangle the poor prisoners, and thus to make it appear that they were traitors at heart.

These six articles were as follows: whether all English subjects were bound to obey the bull of Pius V.; whether all the English ought to obey Elizabeth as their lawful queen, notwithstanding any papal bull already published, or to be published in future times; whether the Pope could give the power to take up arms against her majesty; whether the Pope could, for any cause, absolve the subjects of any princes from their oaths of obedience; whether the teaching of Dr. Sanders, in his book on the "Visible Monarchy of the Church," and of Dr. Bristow, in his book of

"Motives," were true or false upon this point; and, lastly, if the Pope were to declare that Elizabeth were not the lawful queen, and, absolving her subjects from obedience to her, were to invade England, what part ought a good and faithful subject to follow?

Alfred the Great wisely said, that he would have men's thoughts to be as free as air. As long as they are locked up within the heart from which they sprang, they are accountable to God only. When they appear in words and actions, then, and then only, are they liable to human laws.

Elizabeth, however, would fain intrude into this hidden sanctuary: would admit no rights that might, however remotely, interfere with her designs. She despatched her lawyers and her articles, and having sufficiently tortured the minds of her prisoners, held up their answers as proofs of their treason.

The answers of the confessors upon the first article were the following: Luke Kirby was of opinion that there were some causes for which the Pope could lawfully depose a sovereign, and, consequently, in such cases ought to be obeyed.

Thomas Cottam and John Shert refused any answer to this, and all the other articles, except that they believed what the Catholic Church teaches.

Lawrence Richardson replied like Cottam and Shert, to all but the fifth article.

Thomas Ford said, that he could not answer, because he was ignorant of the circumstances under which the bull was issued; but that if a bull issued by Gregory XIII. (the reigning Pope) were to be produced, he would give his opinion upon it.

Robert Johnson refused to answer.

William Filby said, that the Pope had such authority to depose princes; that his sentence when promulgated ought to be obeyed. With regard to the bull of Pius V., he would assert nothing. If, however, it were what it was asserted to be, that he would approve and obey it.

With regard to the first article thus proposed and

answered, it should be remembered that Gregory XIII. had expressly declared that the bull of Pius V. was not, until confirmed by another bull, to be held as binding upon the conscience of Catholics; and that the English government, as was manifest on the trial of Campion, were fully aware of this declaration. Whatever opinion, then, they might extort from men whose love of truth was evident, was, after all, an opinion purely speculative.

With regard to the second article, Luke Kirby thought that in some cases, as, for instance, in infidelity, the sovereign was not to be obeyed against the Pope's bull.

Thomas Ford answered in the same manner, adding that when such a bull was issued, he would then reply what was the duty of a subject, and what the right of a sovereign.

Robert Johnson was ignorant of the extent of the Pope's power in such cases.

William Filby said the question was not easily solved, but that he would answer in general, as he had to the first.

To the third article, all declined an answer, except Robert Johnson, who remarked that the Pope could, in some cases, authorize subjects to take arms against their sovereign.

To the fourth, the replies were that the Pope could in some cases. Filby added that he never could as long as she was actually queen; but only after her deposition.

To the fifth, Kirby replied that Sanders and Bristow could be deceived on such points; but that whether they were or not, was a point which he left to God. Ford, as well as Johnson and Filby, more or less precisely, said, that Sanders and Bristow were learned men, but whether in every point they were exact, it was their place to answer, not his: he would speak for himself alone. Richardson said that he approved of the doctrine of Sanders and Bristow, wherever it agreed with that of the Catholic Church.

To the sixth, all that chose to reply at all, except Johnson, said they would consider what answer to give when the event spoken of took place. Johnson's reply was, that if it were in temporal matters, he would adhere to the queen; if in matters of religion, to the Pope.*

These answers, limited and conditional as most of them were, ought, if fairly weighed, to have proved, even to the most ignorant, that those who held the deposing power, were very far from holding that it could be exercised in any other than extreme cases. Elizabeth's ministers, however, knew very well that if publicly read they could not be thus fairly weighed, and might still, consequently, answer their purpose. Accordingly they were ostentatiously read at the gibbet, where most of these confessors were soon after put to death (May, 1582). Before, however, the execution took place, Elizabeth had recourse to another means of fixing upon the poor priests the crime of treason.

She seems to have been well aware that reiterated assertions produce upon the majority of the people almost the same effect as positive proofs. At all events, she twice, in the course of eighteen months, issued proclamations to denounce the missionary priests as traitors. The second of these was signed and issued the day before Paine's martyrdom. It called the people's attention to the former edict, published fifteen months before, which denounced "the Jesuits, Seminarists, and mass-saying priests," as traitors, and menaced all that should in any way befriend or conceal them, with "pains as bitter as could be inflicted either by the laws of this realm or by the royal authority of her majesty." Having thus

* See the art. and replies printed verbatim in the Concertatio, p. 84, *b*, &c. After all this wringing forth from men's minds of their hidden opinions, and all the course of sanguinary laws that preceded it, Camden is not ashamed to say that Elizabeth never intended to do violence to conscience! "Regina, quæ vim conscientiis afferendam nunquam censuit," &c. (an. 1581, p. 347, Amsterd. 1639).

recapitulated her former edict, the queen stated, that Campion, Sherwine, and Brian, "seminary priests" (as she incorrectly termed them all), had been justly convicted and put to death, "for various crimes of treason." As, however, through the malice and obstinacy of some (so said the proclamation), and the affected ignorance of others, the former edict was little regarded, and as it was asserted in books, that Campion and his companions had been unjustly condemned, all the queen's good subjects were to understand that her majesty and her ministers were satisfied, from letters and confessions, that the object of the Jesuits and Seminarists was, not only to excite rebellion, but to deprive the queen of her crown and life. The proclamation closed with a repetition of the threat and punishment, and added, that all who should continue after three months to reside in the "seminaries or societies," should be considered and dealt with as the abettors of traitors (April 1, 1582).

The futility of this proclamation is obvious. It was justly remarked at the time, that the government knew nothing more than the public, having produced all its evidence on the trial.* Yet a royal edict, however wanting in truth and justice, carries weight.

Allen, therefore, lost no time in drawing up his "Apology; or, Defence of the Jesuits and Seminarists." In this treatise, he protests, that he and his fellow-exiles, so far from loving a foreign abode, have continually bewailed their sins, in atonement for which God has deprived them of their beloved country, allowing them to be banished from those splendid churches which their Catholic ancestors erected for themselves and their Catholic posterity. We grieve over our exile. We grieve, too, that "whilst neither Jews, nor Turks, nor pagans, can be compelled by the Divine or natural law, or by the law of nations, to leave their sect and false persuasion and pass over to another which neither they nor their ancestors, by any

* In the Apologia Martyrum in the Concert. p. 225.

promise or profession, have received, we alone, against Divine and human law, and, so far, against the doctrine of Protestants themselves, are not only deprived of those things which are due to us by right of the name of Christian, but are also compelled in various ways, and those evidently violent, to receive those rites and that religion to which it is manifest that neither we nor our parents nor ancestors ever consented." What increases our grief is, that even amongst the changes of religion in Germany and Switzerland, some parish or church at least in the neighbourhood affords a refuge to Catholics; and that even in Turkey and Persia, "the old Christians have the free exercise of their religion:" in England, on the contrary, although the Catholics are many thousands in number, nay, are the greater part of the population, they are coerced by the inquisition of the civil magistrate, by the vigilance of ministers, by the watchfulness of spies. They are despoiled, often driven from their homes, frustrated in their business and occupations, consumed with unceasing grief. This grief is the more keen, because they know that the compliance which their persecutors endeavour to extort would destroy their souls. Is it any wonder that in this cruel affliction they abandon their country?

Spies, or, as we term them in Scripture phrase, false brethren, have, however, charged us with treason. These informers, evil as they are, have been believed; and this too, although the accused were men of honourable character, and although some amongst them had formerly a share in the administration of the government. Yet God is my witness, that during my whole stay at Rome I neither heard nor saw anything of terms of alliance between the Pope and the king of Spain for invading England. So far from giving any advice regarding such attempts, I knew nothing about them until they were published to the whole world.*

* Apol. cap. i.

Our journey to Rome last year was for no such purpose: it was, as became ecclesiastics and students, to seek consolation and spiritual help from that head of the Church, the Vicar of Christ, from whom emanated the faith of the Britons, and afterwards of our Saxon forefathers, and to whom at all times the afflicted have turned for consolation. We went to Rome, moreover (we speak in all candour and sincerity), to assist in establishing there the English college, and to obtain additional funds for our increasing numbers at Rheims: we went, too, "in order that the superiors of the college at Rome and that of Rheims might render one another mutual assistance, in a government, discipline, and education especially adapted to the dispositions of our people; and in order that all perturbations, to which younger men and institutions for study, especially of those who are living in exile and misery are peculiarly liable, might be removed, or rather cut off." Nor do we repent of the toil of this undertaking, but thank God for having suggested to us so useful a labour, which will educate men in the Chief See, in the fountain of Christianity, amongst the noble academies and institutions which make Rome a great mart of every kind of teaching and knowledge.*

Such colleges were founded with an especial view to the salvation of the various students, and through them of their countrymen. The means to be applied, were not the arms of the flesh, but fastings, prayers, labours. The "opening of this spiritual labour and conflict has already been publicly declared, both in books printed and sent from here to England, as well as in various letters which the pious young men have sent to their relations and friends, in which they earnestly entreat them to attend to the salvation of their souls, and not, under pretence of saving their wealth, and of preserving their patrimony, for their own profit, or even for that of their children and pos-

* Apol. cap. ii.

terity, knowingly and deliberately to seek their own damnation."

Nor let any one be surprised that the Pope should do so much for England. He has founded a college for converted Jews, another for all the German races, and another for the Dalmatians. He has contributed largely to the seminary of the Roman clergy, to various colleges of "the most renowned society of the name of Jesus," to the seminaries of Prague and Vienna, and the succour of the university of Louvain.*

After we have refuted so many charges, another, and the "most odious of all," is brought, not only against us, but even against the Supreme Pontiff: the priests and Jesuits have, it is said, been sent to England to treat, not only of religion and the conscience, but to draw the minds of men from the obedience due to the sovereign, and to plot against the state.

That this charge is utterly groundless the writer of this Apology can prove, by producing, if necessary, authentic documents, which he has in his possession. We protest, therefore, that neither "the reverend fathers of the society of the most holy name of Jesus (usually termed Jesuits)," nor the priests or students of the seminaries, have any instruction or insinuation from the Pope, or other superiors, to do or move any matter against the existing temporal rule, or have any other directions, but to preach, catechize, administer the sacraments, and perform such other offices as are necessary for the souls of the faithful. The Jesuits, moreover, have a clause inserted in their instructions, expressly forbidding them "to interfere in the business of the republic." †

This being the case, where is there any ground for the charge of treason? Or is the administration of the sacraments treason? "As it would be ridiculous and impossible to make by act of parliament the reci-

* Apol. cap. iii.

† "Ne se reipubl. negotiis immisceant, id quod literis propriâ manu nuper a defuncto generali.....doceri potest."—Ib. cap. vi.

tation of the Divine office, according to the rite of the Catholic Church, to be simony, usury, theft, or adultery, so, indeed, is it impossible to make those things which merely concern religion become the crimes of treason, or of contumacy against the sovereign and state.

"Nor indeed can disobedience to any command of the sovereign (if even it regard some lawful matter) make the offence become the crime of high treason; much less can it do so when it touches matters of religion, and is repugnant to the true Word of God and to our obedience to the Divine Majesty, as happened in the case of Daniel and the three children, since it touches those causes which are not truly subject to the temporal prince or his laws.

"For if any temporal prince were to give his sanction to such a law as Darius formerly did, by which he enjoined that for thirty days prayers and supplications should be offered to no one but himself; truly, such a law, or even a thousand such, could not render the man who would refuse to take them a traitor, or bind him any more than in a like case they bound Daniel."

Thanks be to God, many Daniels are still to be found. As soon as the queen's proclamation, published in January, appeared at Rheims, many applied at once to their superiors for permission to go upon the mission. Although most were refused, nineteen were ordained in the following fortnight. They offer their lives for their country; and blood spontaneously poured out for the truth cries out strongly, and with a sort of violence, to the mercy of God.*

* Apol. cap. vi. The above extracts and analysis of part of the Apology will give some idea of its style and subject-matter, yet little of its elegance, cogency, and depth. It is not unworthy of a place beside the apologists of the first ages of the Church. If any one doubts the truthfulness and general accuracy of Allen's writings, or imagines that he hastily caught up every flying rumour of what occurred in England, let him do so much justice to truth as to read over Allen's Preface to his "True, Sincere, and Modest Reply" to the execution of justice; or, still better, let him also peruse both the Reply and the Apology.

It is not easy to discover the direct effect produced by this Apology. The English government, however, grew more than ever anxious to make the world believe that it was not for religion, but for treason, that they had so freely used both rack and gibbet. A treatise for this purpose, called the "Execution of Justice," was printed in all the principal languages of Europe. It was generally supposed to have been written by Lord Burghley. It was refuted by Dr. Allen, and this, on the whole, most cogently. One of the points most frequently urged against the loyalty of Catholics was their doctrine of the Pope's deposing power.

The inconsistency of such an objection Allen proved from the writings of Calvin, Zuinglius, and Knox, who all maintained that wicked princes ought to be deposed. Nor was this doctrine a dead letter: they had endeavoured by open war to reduce it to practice both in France and Scotland, as well as in England in the rebellion of Wyatt.

The only difference on this head between the views of Catholics and those of Protestants was, that Catholics held what had been decided upon three hundred years before in the Council of Lateran, at which the representatives of all Christian princes assembled (1203). It was the settled rule of society—a rule not left to the caprice of private individuals, as in the case of Protestants, but to the decision of Christ's Vicar upon earth.

It was in perfect accordance with this recognized law that Pius V. had pronounced sentence against Elizabeth. This sentence, however, gave the English government no reasonable ground for disquietude; for well did the government know, that before Campion and Persons entered England, the Holy See had formally released all the Catholic subjects of Elizabeth from the operation of Pius the Fifth's declaration.

Allen concluded his long but eloquent and learned Reply, by demonstrating that the only fault of the missionary priests was their heroic attachment to the Holy See. Grievous, however, as was the sin of

England, he was not without hope, when he thought of the blood so generously poured out, and the prayers and fasts publicly offered in every part of the world for the salvation of his country.*

The construction and increase of Catholic seminaries and the devoted spirit of the missionaries was not the only cause of vexation to Elizabeth. Having herself revolted against the supremacy of Rome, she would yet tolerate no questioning of her own assumed supremacy. She laid down an external form of worship, and was so ignorant of human nature, to say nothing of grace, as to think that the free wills of her subjects would stoop down at her beck before the idol which, in her wantonness of power, she had dared to erect.

She had laid down her system, she had pronounced herself "unchangeable;" she had published her code of worship, and of other laws to protect that worship; and yet, after a lapse of five-and-twenty years, her darling project of uniformity was still far from being accomplished. Confusion everywhere reigned. The discipline of her Anglican Church was relaxed; the new liturgy and the authority of her bishops were derided; new sects were springing up; and not only Catholics, but the sterner of the sectarians, were openly braving the laws that enjoined attendance at church.

Such is the picture which Camden and his Scottish contemporary, Johnson, have alike delineated. Nor was this all. The ministers officiating in the parish churches often excited suspicion, some for a leaning to rigid Calvinism, and not a few for being Catholics at heart. The very men whom Elizabeth had raised up as her bishops had sometimes fallen short, or were strongly suspected to have fallen short, of her standard of orthodoxy.

* Allen's Reply, c. 4. In this and the following chapters the whole question of the deposing power, in its broadest form, is amply explained and discussed. See also R. Johnson's Rer. Britan. l. iii. p. 97, an. 1584, and Camd. an. 1580, p. 317.

Edmund Grindall was one of these. After having been successively appointed as bishop of London, York, and Canterbury, he was thought by the queen to favour the Puritans, and incurred her marked displeasure. As soon as he had died, Whitgift, a man whose mind appeared more pliable and more consonant with the views of the "governor" of his church, was named archbishop of Canterbury, and was charged by Elizabeth to restore discipline and enforce uniformity.

A formulary in three articles, intended to detect both Catholicity and Puritanism, was therefore drawn up, and presented for signature to every clergyman. The first article declared "that the queen had highest and supreme power over all natives of her realms, whatever their condition, and that no other foreign prince or bishop has, or ought to have, any power, civil or ecclesiastical, in the realms or dominions of the same." The second declared that the Book of Common Prayer, as well as that for the ordaining of bishops and priests, "contain nothing contrary to the Word of God, but can be lawfully used; and that that formulary, both of prayer and the administration of the sacraments, should be used, and no other." The third article declared that the persons signing this formulary "approved the articles of the synod of London in 1562, published by royal authority, and held the same to be conformable to the Word of God."

These ordinances, so far from allaying, increased for a time the general discord. "It is incredible," exclaims Camden, "what controversies and disputes arose in consequence; how great was the odium Whitgift had to endure; how numerous the reproaches uttered against him by factious ministers; what afflictions and injuries from nobles who made a profit from promoting unworthy clergymen, or who had formed designs upon the property of the Church." *

* Camd. an. 1583, p. 369; R. Johnson's Rer. Brit. an. 1583, p. 89, Amsterd. 1655. Johnson, a Scotch episcopalian, dedicated the two first books of his History to Charles I., but died before the publication of the remaining part of the work. His classical elegance

What a stream of light is thus almost accidentally let fall upon the internal condition of Elizabeth's reformed church! Let those that scout the idea of papal provisions, ponder over the use of patronage thus briefly sketched.

is occasionally marred by his pedantic, and, in that age, rather fashionable, Hellenisms. Plain John Whitgift becomes "Joannes Leucodorus." With loud professions of impartiality, he is the evident, although not violent, partisan of the Stuarts and of Anglicanism.

CHAPTER XV.

INFORMERS—NICHOLS—TYRRELL—BABINGTON'S PLOT TO RELEASE THE QUEEN OF SCOTS—WALSINGHAM'S ARTFUL USE OF THE PLOT—DEATH OF MARY.

THE acts of the English martyrs would be imperfectly understood, and their example be deprived of much of its practical value, if their chief accusers, the numerous class of paid informers, were not sufficiently known.

Wherever the lust of gold exists, this class of men can be called at any moment into existence. Thus was it in the days of Elizabeth. Never before in English history, perhaps never in any history, was this class so numerous, so busy, or so unprincipled. Men of low cunning, and not a few amongst them convicted of forgery, they were well trained for their present office. They assumed every kind of disguise; they were soldiers, priests, students, parsons, at pleasure; they were now in London, now in the country, now on shipboard, now seeking admission, under the most plausible pretences, into the seminaries. Foiled in the discovery of some pretended plot, they scrupled not to turn their arts upon one another.

One of the most notorious was John Nichols, made for such services a Protestant minister. Finding himself not only well paid, but noticed by men in power, he greedily caught up every flying rumour that could please his employers. His first timid charges grew into portentous denunciations. Having been at the seminary at Rome, where he pretended to become a Catholic, and having been expelled for immorality, he came to England, and was immediately employed by the government. He poured out a torrent of charges

(which he afterwards confessed to be false) against the seminaries, the bishops, the cardinals, and the Pope. Most of his narrative was concocted in the Tower. Owen Hopton, the governor, dictated its most thrilling horrors, working upon his victim by alternate promises and threats.

This crafty man, or else his employers, the queen's ministers, were not satisfied with this; they added art upon art to delude the nation. Were it firmly believed that the narrative was the reluctant confession of a sincere Catholic, what could be said against it? Accordingly, on the following Sunday, church-going people were disturbed by a tumult, which, of course, they never thought was a mere imposition. The disturbance was caused by a soldier dragging Nichols by main force to the Protestant church. Well taught by Hopton, Nichols pretended to be a Catholic, and resisted. People's minds being thus villanously prepared, the awful narrative was published. To talk of plots and leagues, and schemes to seize and burn Elizabeth, was not enough; whatever sins a filthy imagination could devise, were laid to the charge of the chief dignitaries of the Catholic Church.

When accusations thus artfully prepared are circulated amongst a credulous people, they easily produce an impression. When the impression is allowed to remain, and is confirmed by some plausible appearances, and by the words or actions of the great, the informer ceases to be an object of contempt and suspicion; he is regarded as a benefactor, and the cold, half-satirical notice of the men of the world becomes for a time a warm greeting, full of transient promise. Nichols, however, found something apparently more substantial than patronage and a name: he enjoyed fifty pounds per annum, a sum levied upon Elizabeth's new bishops.

Whilst thus striking at the Catholic Church, by destroying the reputation of its chiefs, and whilst swearing to the pretended plot of Rheims and Rome, to which Campion and his heroic companions were

sacrificed, the perjured Nichols was incessantly agitated by his evil conscience. Driven by remorse, he found his way, whilst moving to and fro in the Tower, to the window of a cell in which Luke Kirby, one of Campion's brother priests, was confined. Kirby had been tortured by being compressed together in the hoop called, it seems, the "scavenger's daughter;" and was finally condemned along with Campion and his other companions.

Having, on reaching the window, attracted the attention of this heroic confessor, Nichols confessed to him the bitter remorse with which he was consumed, and the utter falsehood of his charges, declaring that he would never more mount the pulpit, but become a schoolmaster.*

Kirby exhorted him to retire to some place of penance; but the wretched man was not so disposed, having, indeed, no intention of becoming a Catholic, and dreading some signal punishment were he to make his appearance upon the continent.

He withdrew; but, tortured by his conscience, he still so far contradicted his previous statements as to excite the anger of his employers. When promises failed, a prison and the terror of the rack always silenced his conscience, and drew from him (if he himself may be credited) charges against Catholics as numerous and black as his principal tempter, the governor of the Tower, could desire.

One of Nichols's acquaintances was a youth named Lawrence Caddey. This young man had yielded to a vehement but perilous desire of returning home from one of the seminaries. In order to prevent any danger to his friends, he presented himself to the bishop of London, and told him he was of the same religion as himself. The bishop, however, suspected him, and required him to make a public profession of Protestantism. The deluded youth wept and entreated;

* Kirby's letter mentioning this conversation may be found in Challoner's Memoirs (Kirby).

but being imprisoned, and fearing worse, consented, and made his recantation at St. Paul's Cross.

Going home, and still acting as a Protestant, he found little of the comfort he expected, so great was his remorse. Becoming acquainted with Nichols, he thought he might make some atonement by removing from the country the cause of so much mischief. If, indeed, his own account is not a mere excuse, this was the cause why he frequented the company of a man whose very friendship (so public was his depravity) was a blight upon a good name: he strove to persuade the informer to flee from the country.

Nichols at last, partly in a fit of despair and partly from resentment at his pension being withheld, listened to Caddey's advice, and hastened with him to Germany, and finally to France. At Rouen he was seized and imprisoned. Trembling for his life, he wrote most pitiable letters to Allen, acknowledging his crimes, but imploring compassion (Feb. 1583). He knew nothing evil, he said, in the lives of the popes, cardinals, and bishops; he never heard the students at Rome speak treasonably, or use menacing terms against Elizabeth or her counsellors. If he had uttered so much evil against them, it was, he pleaded, from being misled by promises, or overcome by terror. "Often used the governor to say to me, 'Do this, or you shall be led to the rack.' I would much rather he had said, you shall be hanged. It is not a pleasant thing for the body to be made by that torture two feet longer than nature intended. The method of torturing was explained to me. When I heard it, my fear and horror of such a torment overcame me."

A full, distinct avowal of his crimes having been made and signed by him, he was released. During his confinement at Rouen there seems to have been no violence employed. He declared himself a Protestant, and was left undisturbed. When at liberty once more, he declared to his Protestant friends (as we are assured by Bridgwater), that his letters to

"Dr. Allen, and his subsequent confession, were strictly true." *

From this account of Nichols, it is manifest that the known informer, who lived by his traffic in blood, was only a secondary agent in the wily designs of government. The man whom they preferred for the entrapping of their victims was one who was of good family, or, as it sometimes happened, an unhappy priest, who had sacrificed conscience to fear or earthly reward. Such a one could for a time elude suspicion. When at last Catholics on the continent had learned to shun him, he might yet be made available in England.

Some idea of the means by which informers and spies were brought together, until an intricate web of mingled politics and religion was thrown around the victim, is exemplified in the closing years of Mary, queen of Scots. Pining away in her prison, and now fearing for her life, this accomplished princess had sent to Spain for rescue. She little thought that Nau, her confidential secretary, was in the pay of Elizabeth. Yet so it was; and Elizabeth's ministers therefore read, and altered as they pleased, poor Mary's letters. Nau was greatly under the influence of Morgan, a Welsh gentleman, who had the administration of Mary's French dower. This would have excited suspicion had it been known. But, even as it was, Morgan's open connection with the emissaries of Walsingham had awakened the distrust of Catholics.

Whether Morgan really shared Nau's treachery has not been distinctly proved. Equally dark is the amount of innocence or guilt on the part of Babington, a young man of good family, and Ballard, a

* The letters and confession are to be found in Bridgw. Concertat. p. 231, &c. Compare them and Lawr. Caddey's account of himself in his Recantation (ib. p. 237), and Allen's Defence or Apologia, c. 2, ad init.

Those that would know something more of the informers, and the arts by which they sometimes led one another to death, will find abundance of information in Lingard's account of Parry, Nevil, &c. (Eliz. c. 7 and 8).

priest. Both of these appeared zealous in Mary's behalf, were forming a scheme for her release, and were in close correspondence with Morgan.* Whether with their knowledge or not, certain is it that Walsingham was not only aware of their design, but was endeavouring by means of Poll, one of his spies who had joined the conspirators, to make their object, not merely a scheme for Mary's liberation, but an avowed attempt upon the life of Elizabeth.† Were he to succeed in this, and to show that Mary was a consenting party, the great object of the government would at once be attained: Mary could without shame be put to death, as an intended murderess.

To secure this object, Ballard and Babington, whether the involuntary or the conscious tools of Walsingham, must be sacrificed. When matters were sufficiently matured, and Mary had consented to receive the proffered aid, although she refused to hear of Elizabeth's death, Ballard, hearing (as if for the first time) that Walsingham was aware of what was going on, offered to disclose to him the whole scheme, but was arrested as a seminary priest. Babington, on this, sought refuge, of all places, in Walsingham's own house. What passed can only be conjectured, except that Babington was promised a license to go abroad as a spy upon the Catholics. To these suspicious circumstances may be added the fact, that many young men whom he himself had enticed into the plot, perished on his own evidence alone.

Walsingham, however, had not yet developed all his arts. A blacker hue must be given to the plot: the Pope, the Jesuits, the Seminarists, and the more

* That Babington before his trial knew but too well that Walsingham "was the chief actor and contriver," is confirmed by Babington's own acknowledgment, the night before his arrest, to Davis, one of the missionary priests.—See Davis's own account, in his memoir of "Holford alias Acton," ap. Challoner's Mem.

† It is singularly characteristic of those days of intrigue, that Nau, whose name is still upon the list of Elizabeth's hirelings, was anxious to prove his zeal for Mary by secretly cautioning her to beware of Poll.—Camd. 1586, p. 436.

zealous of the English Catholics, must be branded with it.

Unhappily, another priest could be found to do the bidding of the unprincipled secretary. This was Anthony Tyrrell. Having allowed himself to become the tool of Walsingham, having, at the beck of his employer, assailed alike the Pope, the Jesuits, and the Seminarists, this man was afterwards so struck with remorse, that he endeavoured to atone for his calumnies by a public denial, and a sincere repentance. Returning, however, to his infamous trade, he was required to make a public declaration that his former accusations were true. Accordingly, he was led to St. Paul's Cross. Great was the triumph of the enemies of the Church, and great their disappointment. Tyrrell had been so tortured with remorse, that he began with declaring himself a Catholic, and, being interrupted, scattered amongst the crowd some copies of a recantation, which he had written and signed. He was committed to prison.

In this instrument he deplores his miserable relapse, declaring the sincerity of his late reconciliation to the Church, and attributing his return to England to the temptations of the devil, and his own sins. He then confessed that his statement, that Gregory XIII. was a consenting party to Elizabeth's death, was utterly false; and equally so that a question regarding her assassination had been proposed by Ballard to the Jesuits, and to Cardinal Allen, and other persons in the seminaries; and also his charges against some other individuals by name, and against "all priests and Catholics, of every rank and condition, as sowers of discord, and promoters of dissension." * As this declaration was not made until 1588, it was too late to impede the machinations of Walsingham.

As early as 1584, this minister, aided by his partners in the government, had worked upon the credulity

* See it in Bridg. Concert., attached to the end of part ii. Aware of Tyrrell's going to St. Paul's Cross to recant, Stowe imagined that he did recant, December, 1588.

and passions of the Protestants, until, at the suggestion of Leicester, men began to form clubs or associations, for the avowed purpose of putting to death all that should attempt, or in whose favour others should attempt, the life of Elizabeth (A.D. 1584). Such a purpose of putting to death by private agreement was itself murder; but Leicester's known influence with Elizabeth was enough for those that sought his favour, or dreaded his resentment, and in a short time the law itself gave a kind of sanction to these irregular proceedings. Meantime, "underhanded stratagems," as Camden avows, "were made use of,—forged letters were furtively introduced under the names of exiles, and left in the houses of the Catholics; and emissaries were sent in all directions to collect rumours and catch up expressions."

When the nation was in a ferment from the widespread associations, and from the various supposed plots and consequent executions, a new bill against the Catholics was introduced, and easily passed. All clergymen ordained by authority or jurisdiction derived from the see of Rome, at any time since the feast of St. John Baptist, 1559, were to quit the kingdom within forty days. If not, or if they returned, they were to be put to death as convicted traitors. All persons that gave aid or support to such clergymen, were to be put to death, "just as if guilty of theft or murder."

All subjects of her majesty being students amongst the Jesuits or in the seminaries, were to return home within six months and to take the oath of supremacy, or to be judged guilty of high treason, and to suffer its penalties.

All that should in any way contribute to the support of such students when not returning, or to that of any of the Jesuits or Seminarist clergy, were to be punished with confiscation and perpetual imprisonment.*

This law, involving in the gravest punishment, and

* Stat. 27 Eliz. c. 2, and Bridgwater.

without previous trial, a considerable body of men, was doubtlessly intended, as the sequel proved, to make short work with the Catholic missionaries, as well as to injure their efficiency, by causing them one and all to be considered, by Protestants at least, as notorious conspirators and traitors.

Such a law would of course fan the existing, and now widely-spreading excitement. Then followed dark hints of plots, and at last, Babington's conspiracy being matured, arrests and executions redoubled (A.D. 1586). Babington and Ballard being no longer needed, were amongst the victims.* And now the time was come to destroy her against whom much of these machinations had really been directed. Mary, queen of Scots, worn out with a harsh confinement of nearly twenty years, was now to be put to death.

The people had been fully prepared. The government, therefore, named a commission to bring her to trial. The charge was having compassed Elizabeth's death. Proofs were, indeed, wanting, and the "foreign jurisdiction" of the court was firmly declined by the Scottish queen; but in the private councils of government, her condemnation had been already determined upon. The trial was a mere form, and Mary was doomed to the axe.† She died with a

* Camden's account of the execution is brief, but full of horror. (When, in the whole course of our history, were executions so unchristian perpetrated?) "Suspensi, demissi, genitalibus abscissis, vivi, videntesque exenterati, et membratim dissecti" (an. 1586, p. 443).

† Compare Camd. an. 1584, 1586 (whose account, indeed, is only an echo of the charges raked up by the government), and Tyrrell's Recantation (Concert.), and the documents in Tytler's Scotl. (vol. vii. and viii.), and Labanoff, tom. vii. passim. The proof, attempted to be brought home, of Mary having consented to the proposal of Elizabeth's death, was made to rest upon certain copies of her letters. Mary denied their genuineness; but the court, instead of producing the originals, remained contented with the vague statements of Babington and Nau that the copies, to the best of their belief, were faithful. What was really said in evidence by Nau and by the other secretary, Curle, who appears to have been quite under the influence of Nau, was not allowed to reach the ears of the doomed queen of Scots, but was received in the secret tribunal of the Star Chamber.

sweetly-tempered courage, declaring herself a Catholic, and protesting her innocence of any attempt upon the life of Elizabeth (Feb. 1587).

It was probably such as a paid traitor, who had long been betraying his mistress's correspondence, was expected to give. Nau, indeed, publicly denied that anything touching the main fact had been written. The printed account, however, spoke differently; and Mary herself declared Nau to be the cause of her death.

CHAPTER XVI.

A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE PERSECUTION FROM THE DEATH OF CAMPION TO THE END OF THE REIGN: WALSINGHAM'S INSOLENCE; STATE OF THE PRISONS; "LITTLE EASE;" THOMAS FELTON; PUNISHMENT FOR PETITIONING; MARTYRDOM OF MARGARET CLITHEROE, MARGARET WARD, AND ANN LYNE; SOUTHWELL.

WHILST informers' tales and fictitious plots were filling the minds of Protestants with hatred of all priests, and especially of Jesuits, the general spirit of persecution burned, as might be expected, more fiercely than ever. It was not enough that Campion had been put to death, nor that Persons had left the country, and that other Jesuits were in prison: blow must follow blow, until missionaries dared not enter England, and the Catholics, exhausted and impoverished, abandoned themselves to despair. God, in his mercy, prevented the full success of this impious plan. But not a year of Elizabeth's reign now passed without blood.

It would be tedious to narrate the repetition of searches, or that of the tortures and death of the many victims, both priests and laics, who thus, year after year, suffered for their undaunted obedience to the chair of St. Peter. A few facts, however, may still be worthy of a brief narration.

A prisoner for the faith was by no means treated with the forbearance now extended (right or wrong) to all criminals. Early in 1583, Munden, a priest, once a fellow of New College, Oxford, was arrested and examined, previous to trial or even committal, by Secretary Walsingham. After inveighing "bitterly against the Seminarists, and against the translation of the New Testament, lately published at Rheims," Walsingham put a variety of questions. Amongst the

rest, he inquired whether Munden acknowledged Elizabeth to be "true queen of England." "He answered yes. But, said Walsingham, do you allow her to be queen as well *de jure* as *de facto?* I do not rightly understand, said Mr. Munden, the meaning of those terms. How now, traitor, said Walsingham, do you boggle at answering this? And therewithal, gave him such a blow on one side of the head as perfectly stunned him, and made him reel; so that for some days after, he complained of a difficulty of hearing on that side."*

While ill-treatment of every kind thus awaited those that were captured, the number of these unresisting victims was continually increased (1584). In the following year, the houses of fifty Catholic gentlemen of Lancashire were, under pretence of searching for priests, entered by pursuivants in one night. The houses were pillaged; the gentlemen cast into prison. So great, indeed, were the numbers thus arrested in all parts of the kingdom, that the old prisons were "crowded with Catholics, and new ones erected," even as early as the missionary travels of Campion.†

The nature of these prisons it would be almost impossible for the imagination to depict. That they were ill-drained, ill-lighted, ill-ventilated, the present age knows but too well; and that such places are nurseries of fever, and every kind of loathsome disease, late inquiries of sanitory commissions have fully demonstrated: yet we know fully the prisons of only the present or the past century. Those of an age when the prison was built for express punishment, and when frequent deaths elicited no surprise, were simply indescribable; yet it was in spots chosen out of all the prison for their inconvenience or filthiness, that the confessors of the old faith were

* Challoner's Memoirs (Munden).

† So he himself testifies in his letter to the general: see his "Decem Rationes" and other works, 2nd ed. Antwerp, 1631. Bridgwater's Concert. p. 412. F. Persons attests the same fact: the prisons are so "crammed with Catholics" that "there is scarcely room for thieves;" and "the great number recently built are insufficient."—Ep. de Persecut.

frequently shut up. One is kept prisoner "for two months in a certain dark hole designed for keeping coals;" that "lying here on the bare floor, without any bed, he was brought to death's door; and though, at the earnest suit of his friends, he was changed to a more commodious prison, yet, being too far gone to be recovered, died within two days."

Another is lodged in Newgate, at the mouth of a filthy hole used as a general cess-pool for the prison, "where he perished by the stench within eight days."*

A once unlighted recess, in the walls of the Tower (if my memory fail me not), is still pointed out as "Little Ease." A brief extract will both show the use which was made of this, as well as throw additional light upon the treatment of Catholics.

Thomas Felton, a very young man, the son of that Felton who affixed the Pope's bull to the gates of the bishop of London's palace at St. Paul's, had become a page to Lady Lovett, and afterwards had studied at Rheims, and, receiving the tonsure, had, with the consent of Dr. Allen, entered the religious order of Minims. His feebleness of health, however, obliged him to return to England. On his way back to the continent, he was arrested; set free by powerful mediation; and again twice arrested. The third time, he was "first put into Little Ease, where he remained three days and three nights, not being able to stand, or lie, or sit; and fed only with bread and water."

This the keeper and his wife told Frances Felton, the prisoner's sister, who wrote an account of his sufferings. "After this, he was put into the mill to grind, and was fed no otherwise all the while he laboured in it, than he had been before in Little Ease, viz., with bread and water only. Then he was hanged up by the hands, to the end to draw from him, by way of confession, what priests he knew beyond the seas or in England: which punishment was so grievous, that therewith the blood sprung forth at his fingers' ends. At another time, upon a Sunday, he was

* Chall.'s Mem. p. 91.

violently taken by certain officers, and carried betwixt two, fast bound in a chair, into the chapel at Bridewell, to their service. He having his hands, at first, at liberty, stopped his ears with his fingers, that he might not hear what the minister said. Then they bound down his hands also to the chair; but being set down to the ground, bound in the manner aforesaid, he stamped with his feet, and made that noise with his mouth, shouting and holloing, and crying oftentimes, Jesus, Jesus, that nothing which the minister said could be heard by any then present at the service. His sister, Frances Felton aforementioned, was present at the church, at this passage, not being then a Catholic.

"After this, he was called to the bar, at the sessions of Newgate; the Spanish fleet making towards England, having then newly been defeated, he was questioned, whether he would have taken the queen's part, or the Pope's and Spaniards', if those forces had landed? He answered, he would have taken part with God and his country. Then the judge asked him, whether he did acknowledge the queen to be the supreme head of the Church of England? Whereunto he made answer, that he had read divers chronicles, but never read that God ordained a woman should be supreme head of the Church. For this speech of his, the judge condemned him" (A.D. 1588).*

In this state of affliction, pitiable, indeed, in the eyes of the world, but glorious in those of faith, the Catholics still occasionally asserted the right of English subjects to petition, humbly, but frankly, for redress. In 1585, new statutes were introduced, making it high treason for any one made priest during any part of Elizabeth's reign by authority derived from Rome, to remain in the country, or simply to return to it; and felony for any one knowingly to aid such a priest. To avert so grievous an enactment, Mr. Shelley, a gentleman of Sussex, pre-

* Ap. Chall.'s Mem. Miss. Priests.

sented a dutiful petition to the queen. The only reply was his own imprisonment until death.*

Amongst those that were charged with harbouring and relieving priests, was Mrs. Margaret Clitheroe, a lady of good family in Yorkshire. On her being asked to plead either guilty or not guilty, she refused to plead at all. She feared that other innocent persons might be involved with her, or that the jury would commit grievous sin by finding her guilty, without sufficient evidence. Whatever may be thought of her fears, she firmly refused to plead. She was, therefore, subjected to the torture usual in such cases, the *peine forte et dure*. On her way to execution, she repeatedly exclaimed, "This way to heaven is as short as any other." Arrived at the appointed place, she was made to lie upon the ground, with a sharp stone, the size of a man's fist, under her back. Her hands, which she had joined in prayer, were parted, and being stretched out, were tied to two posts. A door was then laid upon her, and weights were placed upon the door, until they amounted to seven or eight hundredweight. As she began to feel the pressure, she exclaimed: "Jesu, Jesu, Jesu, have mercy on me." Then remaining silent, whilst her ribs broke beneath the crushing weight, she endured the excessive torment for a quarter of an hour, and then placidly yielded up her soul (March 25, 1586).

Her husband was forced into banishment. Her children, for answering as became good Catholics and the family of such a mother, were whipped; and the eldest, who was but twelve years old, was committed to prison.†

Mrs. Clitheroe was not the only woman who suffered death under these sanguinary laws. A Mrs. Margaret Ward was loaded with irons, and scourged, and at length found guilty of felony, for contriving the escape

* Apud Chall.'s Mem. p. 94, ed. of 1803.

† See Concert. p. 410, *b*; and extracts from a contemporary in Mem. of Miss. Priests, and from an eye-witness, in Ling.; Append. to Eliz. FF.

of a priest from confinement. She was offered life on condition of going to church. She replied, that the queen herself, if she had the bowels of a woman, would have done as much, if she knew the ill treatment he underwent: but that, as for going to church, she never would. She died with the same constancy (Aug. 1588).*

When Mrs. Ward and her companions in martyrdom, three laymen and one priest, were on their way to execution, a lady "of fashion" called aloud to them to be constant in their faith, and, forcing her way through the crowd, knelt down and requested their blessing. She was immediately committed to prison. She is lost sight of, along with a vast multitude of others, upon whom the prison gates had once, and it seems for ever, closed.†

Before the death of Elizabeth, many other ladies suffered more or less; and some narrowly escaped the gibbet and the stake. One more, however, underwent the death of a felon, on suspicion of having had a priest in her house. This was a Mrs. Ann Line, a widow lady of infirm health. The house was not her own, but had been hired by Father Gerard, a Jesuit. This zealous man was then under so unusually easy a confinement at Winchester, that he was enabled to send young men to college, to provide for priests just arriving in England, and to discharge most of the usual duties of the mission. It was for the convenience of priests that he found means to rent the house in which Mrs. Line was taken, and which she had thriftily managed for three years. This lady "told her confessor some years before her death, that Mr. Thompson 'Blakeburn,' a former confessor of hers, who ended his days by martyrdom in 1586, had promised her, that if God should make him worthy of that glorious end, he would pray for her, that she might obtain the like happiness." His promise,

* Ap. Chall. Mem.

† Ap. Chall. Mem. p. 121, from Champney, Ribadaneira, and the bishop of Yepez.

he seems to have kept: having received sentence, and being now at the gallows at Tyburn, she spoke as follows with a loud voice: "I am sentenced to die for harbouring a Catholic priest; and so far I am from repenting for having so done, that I wish, with all my soul, that where I have entertained one, I could have entertained a thousand." Thus courageously did she die (Feb. 2, 1601).*

In the interval between the deaths of Mrs. Ward and Mrs. Line, the priest and poet, Father Robert Southwell, was seized and martyred. He was educated partly at Douay and partly at Rome. Longing for the conquest of souls, he had a strong desire to preach to the inhabitants of Hindostan. As, however, England held out the palm of martyrdom almost within his grasp, and as Father Garnet, one of the most good and learned of the society, was preparing to enter upon the English mission, Father Southwell seized the opportunity, and obtained permission to accompany him (A.D. 1586).

The mere fact of his landing in England was, by a law of the preceding year, high treason. Whether the government had been fatigued by its own sanguinary course, or had wished (as the queen's language indeed proved) to appear reluctant to shed blood, or had desired to sate its vengeance without any other form than would be sufficient to bring home to the accused the fact of his being a priest, certain it is that the queen had procured from her servile parliament power to destroy all priests, who, being exiled, should return to England, or who, after forty days, whether exiled or not, should dare to enter her dominions (A.D. 1585). In the course of the following summer, a considerable number of priests were taken from the different prisons, put on ship-board, and sent across the sea. Their expostulations, at being thus banished without trial, were unheeded. One party of these banished confessors protested publicly on the Tower

* Ib. from Dr. Champney's MS. History; More, lib. vi. No. 13.

stairs that they would sooner die than leave their country and their Catholic brethren. No matter: go they must. On their voyage, they prevailed on their conductors to show them the queen's letters. These declared, that although the persons thus exiled deserved death for their machinations and treasons, as proved both by their own confessions and by that of others, yet out of her royal clemency, the queen was pleased to act more mercifully, and to be satisfied with their banishment. On hearing this, the exiles with one voice declared themselves innocent, adding that they had never confessed one tittle of such a charge, and imploring the officers to take them back, that they might have the matter cleared up by a public trial.

They, however, alleged their orders; and landed their prisoners on the coast of France.*

It is worthy of remark, as a practical commentary upon the queen's letter, that in the following year, that in which Garnet and Southwell arrived in England, there were more executions of priests who had had nothing whatever to do with politics, than in any preceding year.†

Such was the state of the persecution when Father Southwell began his apostolic labours. Of the general condition of the Catholics when he had spent five years amongst them he thus wrote: "Up to this time I am living and well, unworthy, it seems, of a dungeon. The condition of the Catholics is the same as ever, wretched and full of fear and danger, especially since the panic of the war. Ours in prison rejoice and exult; those who are free neither believe that their freedom will last nor care much about it. All are arming themselves to endure whatever may happen in the cause of God, about whose glory and the salvation of souls they are more solicitous than about temporal losses" (Jan. 16, 1591). In another letter, written two months later, he speaks of some danger

* Concertat. p. 411 ("Brevis Descriptio," &c.)
† See Chall.'s Mem.

from which he had escaped, and adds, "I think I see in this island the beginnings of the religious life, the seeds of which we are sowing in tears, that others coming with joyfulness may carry their sheaves. We have sung a new canticle in a strange land. We have sucked honey out of the rock, and oil out of the hardest stone. In other letters I have written of the martyrdom of two priests. With such dew is the Church irrigated, so that in showers of this kind it may spring up and rejoice. We, too, although most unworthy, are expecting the day when our reward shall come. We ask your prayers, that the Father of Lights may give us celestial light, and the Prince of Peace may strengthen me with a perfect spirit." *

During the greater part of his time he was immured in the upper part of the house of the countess of Arundel, being her chaplain. Only one or two of the domestics knew of his presence. Nor could they dare to convey to him food and other necessaries except with the greatest caution. The earl himself was a prisoner in the Tower.

The good father rejoiced in his solitude. In a letter, written to a priest who was obliged it seems to continue a roaming life, Father Southwell pointed out to him its dangers: "You will rarely meet with virtue on the king's highway. Change is the mother of idleness and inconstancy. Dear is that experience which is paid for by the security of virtue. We are pilgrims, but not wanderers. Surrender not your mind to such a variety, but let it take root in one soil. Flowers perish by being too often transplanted." †

Besides his correspondence and his own spiritual exercises, Father Southwell wrote various poems, and those beautiful pieces so highly esteemed by Catholics even to the present day, "St. Peter's Groans," and "Mary Magdalen's Funeral Tears."

The time for which he longed was now at hand, when he was to enter upon his last conflict. He used

* See the extracts in More, lib. v. No. 19.
† Ap. More, l. v. No. 22.

from time to time to steal away from his usual abode, in order to assist in the general work of the mission. Amongst other places he visited the Bellamys, a Catholic family at Uxenden, near Harrow-on-the-Hill. It was there that he was captured.

The manner of his arrest shows the vicissitudes of those trying times. Ann Bellamy, one of the young ladies of the family at Uxenden, having been imprisoned for religion at Westminster Gate-house, allowed herself by degrees to be so tampered with by Topcliffe, the governor of the prison, as to surrender both her faith and her chastity. To crown all, she made Topcliffe fully understand the nature of the hiding-place at her father's house at Uxenden, and then wrote to Father Southwell, to solicit an interview with him at her father's house, on important business. Ever thirsting for the salvation of souls, the unsuspecting missionary repaired to that place, and awaited her arrival. Topcliffe and his band were now at the gates, and entering, went direct, to the astonishment of the family, to a flag in the pavement, which covered a subterranean vault. This they raised, and then derisively summoned Father Southwell to issue forth. He did so, and they at once seized him, and carried him off.

The government was, as usual, certified of his arrest; but as he was of a noble family, and his mother was high in favour with Elizabeth (having been her Latin professor), instead of being shut up in an ordinary prison, he was consigned to what might appear a more lenient detention, under the care of Topcliffe.

The details of his sufferings, although narrated by a writer of the following century, are partly confirmed by contemporary accounts, and therefore appear to be sufficiently trustworthy. Scarcely had he entered Topcliffe's house when he was stripped, a girdle being fastened round his loins, and his arms being stretched out his wrists were fastened with handcuffs, bristling inside with iron points; and then he was hoisted up

with his face to the wall, to which his handcuffs were now fastened as far asunder as possible. Whilst thus suspended by his wrists, his legs were bent backward until his feet could be fastened to his girdle. Whilst his muscles were thus distended almost to bursting, and blood was dripping fast upon the ground, Topcliffe stood by, threatening what he would do unless the martyr "confessed." For more than seven hours the torment continued. Seeing at last that his victim was almost lifeless, the governor had him taken down. On the following day the torment was renewed.

For eleven days Topcliffe, sometimes under the eye of the elder Cecil, exerted all his barbarous ingenuity. Being completely baffled, he led his prisoner to the Queen's Bench. There he acknowledged that he was a priest and a Jesuit, and that he had come to teach the Catholic faith as he had received it from the fountain-head, the see of Rome. "Slay me, if you will," he added, "but try not human strength by unheard-of tortures. Mark not your name, your age, your nation, with the brand of dire cruelty. Remember God is your judge."—"Do you call my house a prison, a torture-chamber? Have I a single rack there?" exclaimed Topcliffe. The martyr appealed to his feet, on which he could scarcely stand, and to the livid and swollen arms, which he laid bare, and then told what he had suffered. Seeing that there was now arising in the spectators a strong feeling of indignation, Topcliffe produced a warrant, written by the queen's ministers, and authorizing him to torture at his discretion.

This was enough for Coke, the judge. He cried out, "You Jesuits are so traitorous a set that it is right and good to make an example of you." "I should like," chimed in Topcliffe, "to tie them all in one fagot, and would soon scatter their ashes to the winds."

He went home with his saintly prisoner, and wreaked his vengeance upon him as such a nature

knows how. He was, however, disturbed in his banquet of blood.

Such an indignant feeling had arisen from the late disclosures at the Queen's Bench, that Cecil and his fellow-ministers were glad to save their own popularity by arresting Topcliffe on a charge of having exceeded his powers. His confinement, however, was soon terminated.

Southwell, meantime, was again shut up in prison. His aged father went there to see him, and could scarcely recognize his son. He found him half-naked, swarming with worms, scarcely able to speak; his very clothes, such as they were, rotting. Quite overcome, the poor father sunk, weeping and fainting, at his son's feet. Then, hastening to the queen, he poured out all the eloquence of such a sorrow; narrated the services of his family, and pleaded for at least a trial, and, if need be, death, instead of such a punishment. All that he could obtain, however, was permission to furnish clothes, and a little food. His son was afterwards removed to the Tower, and from the Tower to Newgate. Here his lodging was a hole underground, utterly impervious to light, and almost to common air. It was known by the significant epithet of Limbo. The keeper, who let down to him in a basket his morsel of musty bread and his mug of water, was so struck at the total absence of groans or murmurs, that he stole down, and suddenly opened his dark-lantern upon him. The sweet and even joyous resignation marked upon his face and mien, and not less in his whole deportment, so struck the man, although he was a Puritan, that he did all in his power to alleviate the confessor's affliction (March, 1595).

Being at last tried, at his own request, he was accused of being a priest by authority derived from the see of Rome; and of having resided at Uxenden with a traitorous object, and against the queen's peace, crown, and dignity.

He stoutly denied at once the charge of being a traitor. When asked if he would submit himself to

the judgment of God and his country, he answered, that he could not be justly tried by unjust laws, but would not decline, since they wished it; only they should take care that they did nothing against the Divine law.

As usual in all such cases, the great effort of the court was to establish a charge of high treason. Southwell was therefore asked, why he had attempted to administer the sacraments to Catholics when it was forbidden by law. The Apostles, he answered, being equally forbidden by law to preach, had replied, It is better to obey God rather than man. Are you not told, the court added, to "render to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's?"—Yes; and to God, he replied, "the things which are God's."

The only means left of establishing the charge of treason was the fact of being a priest in communion with the Holy See, and of having, after such a step, resided in England.

Coke, the queen's advocate, now demanded sentence, and Southwell was asked what more he had to say. Only this, he replied, that God would pardon the authors of my death.

He was executed at Tyburn (3rd March, 1595). When he was drawing near the gallows, he exclaimed: "Whether we live, we live unto the Lord, or whether we die, we die unto the Lord. Therefore, whether we live or whether we die, we are the Lord's." *

* Compare Chall. Mem. Miss. Priests, Juvencius, Rome, 1710; and Barnes's Arraignment and Speech, App. No. 37; Tierney's Dodd, vol. iii. p. excvii. See also, in confirmation of what is said of Topcliffe's private torturing, the extracts in Tierney's Dodd, iii. p. 118.

CHAPTER XVII.

WALSINGHAM'S EMISSARIES AT ROME — A DISSENSION IN THE ENGLISH SEMINARY—FATHER PERSONS AND THE HOUSES OF SEVILLE, VALLADOLID, AND ST. OMER'S—THE CONFESSORS AT WISBEACH — METTAM—WESTON — SOME AGITATION — PEACE—THE COLLEGE AT ROME QUIETED BY BARRETT AND PERSONS.

THE history of the close of Elizabeth's reign would scarcely be sufficiently complete without another glance at the internal trials of the English college at Rome, as well as some passing notice of the confessors in Wisbeach Castle.

When Dr. Clenock had been removed from the rectorship of that college, and a Jesuit had been appointed, the studies were prosecuted for nine years with tranquillity and vigour. During that time, about one hundred of its students were sent upon the English mission, whilst nineteen enrolled themselves amongst the Jesuits. The efficiency of the establishment was provoking enough to such a man as Walsingham. He had recourse to his usual arts. His emissaries found means to obtain admittance, sometimes into the very walls, sometimes at least into the neighbourhood of the seminary. Amongst these were Aldred and Fisher. Their evil purposes, whether designedly or not, were sustained by Morgan, Paget, and several other apparently respectable men, upon whom, as their course of action developed itself, strong suspicion fell that they too were either agents or tools of the crafty secretary.

The underhanded schemes of Paget and Morgan for the liberation of Mary, queen of Scots, had always been opposed by both Allen and Persons. The latter, indeed, longed for Mary's escape; but for effecting this they trusted to the efforts of the king of Spain, the Pope, and

the duke of Guise: the advances of conspirators they repudiated and detested. This produced estrangement, and the estrangement was deepened by the difference of view regarding the succession to the English throne. Hence arose insinuations against Persons, and even, though perhaps more moderately, against Allen. Both, they said, ought to be deterred from writing, and the Jesuits, moreover, ought to be recalled entirely from England. The latter assertion was evidently a mere paradox. Considering the small number of priests in England, to withdraw any part would be to deprive multitudes of the few opportunities which they already had of approaching the sacraments. Still this assertion was often reiterated at Rome: the English government would treat the Catholics with less rigour, it was said, if both points were conceded. Yet how could these busy men know this? The plan of Elizabeth was evident: to make all acknowledge her supremacy, and to crush all that opposed such a claim. Just in proportion to the zeal with which Catholics opposed it, would be her wrath. This they well knew when they made up their minds to remain Catholics, and therefore they had hailed with joy the arrival of Campion, Persons, and others, who were most energetic in exposing the fallacy of Elizabeth's claim, and in encouraging all to remain firm to the Holy See. How, then, could such an assertion be probable? Or, if probable, was it not a proof that the government would be milder, only because its plan was less disturbed? Then, again, how could these men know the intentions of government unless secretly connected with it?

It is not, therefore, surprising that the effect of their statements was at first very trifling. They soon, however, devised a more successful plan. They saw that the students were mostly young men, inexperienced, indeed, but full of ardour; that they studied not only at the foot of the cross, but at the foot of the scaffold, with minds glowing with the remembrance of their martyred brethren, and with ears tingling with the

salutation, "Hail! Flowers of the Martyrs," with which St. Philip Neri, who lived opposite their house, never failed to greet them.

It was this very ardour upon which the sowers of dissension now calculated. They wished to make their young victims so estimate their own calling as to contemn all others, and especially their own teachers, the Jesuits. They put, therefore, the insidious question: Which of these two states of life is the more excellent,—that in which men bind themselves by vow to attempt no enterprise, however excellent, without the consent of their superiors? or that in which men, having pledged themselves at college to receive the priesthood, hasten joyfully to perils, snares, dungeons, tortures, and the gibbet for the propagation of the faith?

The fact that the Jesuits were hastening with no less alacrity to suffering and death in every part of the world, adding to the crown of martyrdom the merit of self-renunciation and obedience; all this was kept in the back-ground. What was held continually before the eyes of the students was the heroism of their own labours for the English mission. This having been done, the two questions were asked again and again. They were not proposed as theoretical school-exercises, but as matters requiring a practical solution. It was of course the business of the Pope and his advisers to have discussed and settled all such matters: it was not the place of an humble, obedient student to enter into such considerations, but in study and prayer to endure inconveniences, and to make the most of his opportunities.

There were, as might, therefore, be expected, not a few at the English college whose virtue and good sense enabled them either to shun those discussions, or to see clearly the reasonable answer to both questions, and to revere and love as before their able and saintly superiors. Some, however, there were who fell into the snare, who began to distrust and contemn the Jesuits, and to endeavour to excite in others the same unbecoming feelings.

A few of the students upon whom these arts had made an impression were strongly inclined to the religious state. As if the principle involved in the Two Questions were not as applicable to one religious order as to another, these young men were advised to join any order but that of the Jesuits. Such advice ought, perhaps, to have opened their eyes, and made them perceive that it was not a love of principle but animosity to the Jesuits that had dictated the questions. Their feelings, however, had been too deeply excited to yield easily to reason: seven amongst them adopted the factious counsel, and, withdrawing from the college without the knowledge of their superiors, entered a Dominican convent. It is not surprising that few amongst them persevered in their new and more arduous state of life.

The dissension in the college had, meantime, attracted attention. Two bishops examined into its origin and object, and, by command of Sixtus V., expelled the refractory. The appointment to the office of rector, of one who was an Englishman as well as a Jesuit, and the residence in Rome of Allen, now created cardinal, allayed for a time the remains of the excitement* (Aug. 1587).

Other seminaries besides those of Rome and Rheims were now, through the efforts of Father Persons, arising in various places, for supplying the English mission. About a month after Campion's martyrdom, Persons had returned to the continent. His object was to communicate with Allen, who was

* More, lib. iv. No. 14; and lib. vi. No. 28. The Pope had intended, in case of the success of the Spanish Armada, to employ Allen as his legate in England.—(Allen's Admonition, 51 and 52—extract in Tierney, iii. p. 28.) This Admonition was never published. It was intended to be widely circulated in England as soon as the Spanish army landed. On the failure of the expedition, the copies were so carefully destroyed that not more than one or two are known to exist. Those that believe Elizabeth to have been born in lawful wedlock, and that, having lawfully succeeded, she was no tyrant; or that, being a tyrant, she was still to be obeyed, and never resisted,—those that believe and think thus, may consistently raise their hands and eyes in astonishment at the tone of the Admonition.

head of the secular clergy; to print various works, and amongst them his celebrated Directory; and, finally, to procure missionaries for Scotland as well as England.

He was labouring for these and similar purposes, and especially for the completion of a seminary which he had begun at Auge, in Normandy, when his superiors, finding how vehement was the search for him in various parts of England, forbade his return.*

This prohibition did not abate his ardent exertions for the mission. Having been sent to Philip II. of Spain on general business of his order, he received a request for help from Barrett, now president of the Douay seminary. On the murder of the duke of Guise (A.D. 1588), the seminary had been removed from Rheims to Douay, its former seat. The students increasing, and various causes of expense arising, its funds began to be embarrassed. Barrett therefore requested Persons to mediate with Philip for an increase of salary. Distrusting, however, the permanency of a college which had thus been twice removed, Persons proposed an alternative. He wrote to assure Barrett that if he would send him ten or twelve promising subjects, he had no doubt that he could place them advantageously under the patronage of certain bishops and noblemen. Thirteen young men were accordingly sent in the course of the year; others joined them from England; and thus, through the generosity of the Spaniards of all classes, a new seminary sprang up in Valladolid, and soon numbered sixty scholars (A.D. 1590).

A similar establishment was likewise founded at Seville by the munificence of Bartholomew Perez, an intimate friend of Persons (A.D. 1591). A house too had been purchased by Persons at Lisbon; and another had been procured at St. Lucar, near Seville, for the convenience of English merchants and seamen, as well as of priests on their way to England. In all these, as a letter from the corporation of Seville to the

* More (Lett. of F. Persons, &c.), lib. iv. Nos. 1—11.

Pope testifies, there reigned such learning, recollection, and modesty, as to excite universal admiration (A.D. 1596). They were regarded not merely as the abodes of devout men, but of martyrs, who were preparing to seal their faith with their blood. Although our city, the letter continues, is hostile to the whole English nation on account of the losses inflicted by its pirates, yet our good-will, so far from being cooled, is rather inflamed with an eager desire of obtaining for them every favour and grace.*

Father Persons was not yet weary of his arduous task: a full supply was not yet, he thought, provided for the English mission; and this the more, because the seminaries had consequently so many demands upon them, that they were sometimes obliged to send out men only half trained to their task. Father Persons therefore desired to establish a school for the young, where they might be early trained to piety, and proceed through a solid course of humanities to poetry and rhetoric; and thus to philosophy and theology. It was, in short, a college very similar to the seminary at Douay, or rather to the plan of the Council of Trent. Such a school appeared doubly necessary; both because, by a recent law, the children of Catholics were to be forcibly taken from their parents, and brought up as Protestants; and because it was found by experience, says More, that men from the universities, when received into the Church after a slight instruction, and then, after a hasty course of a few years, made priests, and sent back to England, "were more easily forced from the right path to their former ways than those who, having imbibed piety and knowledge from their tender years, were more firmly rooted." For this purpose, but not without great opposition, he contrived to establish the Jesuits' college of St. Omer's.

These were, indeed, grave reasons for such a project;

* More (fr. Yepez), lib. v. Nos. 1—6. See also Tierney's account, drawn from the M.S. annals of Valladolid, &c., Tierney's Dodd, ii. pp. 177 and 179.

but in the opinion of Allen and Barrett it was calculated to interfere with the prosperity of Douay. The event proved that their alarm was groundless. Both colleges long continued to flourish.*

Cardinal Allen was now drawing to the close of his long and useful career. He expired at Rome, as placidly as he had lived, on the 16th of October, 1594. He was buried in the church of the English college.†

His death was soon followed by fresh contentions, first in England, and then in the English College at Rome.

In England it manifested itself in Wisbeach Castle, even amongst confessors who were yet in chains. Wisbeach Castle was a dilapidated, ruinous building, which had been the property of the bishops of Ely, but was now used as a gaol. Within it were dreary, roofless walls, and courtyards heaped with rubbish; and without, mud and stagnant waters, and the dull, reedy vegetation, and heavy skies, that complete the desolation of so marshy and undrained a country.

To this place were brought from various parts upwards of thirty priests. To this glorious company was added Thomas Watson, the Catholic bishop of Lincoln, who had suffered under Edward VI., as he was now suffering under Elizabeth, and Feckenham, the almost equally illustrious abbot of Westminster. All these confessors were there kept, more or less, in solitude, filth, and want, as long as Grey, their ruthless governor, lived. After his death they were allowed to meet freely. Their more illustrious companions were, however, no longer amongst them: they had passed to their reward. Watson of Lincoln died in 1583, and Feckenham in 1585. The rest immediately sought to derive from their new privilege, not a mere empty consolation, but solid spiritual improvement.

* More, v. 6 and 7; Pitseus, De Illust. Script.

† There are, perhaps, but two facts for which any censure, whether right or wrong, has been awarded to this great man: his "Admonition" (if he were, indeed, its author) when the Armada was sailing for England, and his leaning to the Spanish party.

It was agreed to have frequent public prayer, various useful studies, lectures upon the Holy Scriptures, all by a common rule, which should regulate everything from the hour of rising to the hour of retiring to rest. There was no dissentient voice, all joyfully concurring, but the soul of the arrangement was Thomas Mettam.

This illustrious confessor had voluntarily quitted ease, house, family, and country for the faith. Having studied, as usual, the classics, and other branches of literature, as well as Hebrew, philosophy, and theology, he was ordained priest, and immediately sailed for England. He was arrested on his first landing, and after four years' confinement in the Tower, he was transferred from prison to prison, until he found himself at last in Wisbeach Castle, where he closed his hidden, but holy and useful career, after nearly eighteen years of imprisonment (A.D. 1592).

Before he was conducted to Wisbeach, he obtained, under condition of strict secrecy, what he had long sought, that his name should be enrolled in the Society of Jesus (May, 1579). As a man truly religious in spirit, he added to the sufferings of a prison a course of voluntary mortifications, and was the chief promoter of the common method of life adopted at Wisbeach Castle. In the discussions which this new kind of community held upon the Holy Scriptures, Mettam's ample knowledge of Greek and Hebrew rendered important service.*

When, to their great joy, the learned Jesuit, Weston, had been added to their number, they made him the

* Pitseus, De Illust. Script. (Watson and Feckenham); Persons, De Persec. in the Concert. p. 31; More, l. iv. No. 15; Juvencius's Hist. Soc. Jes. l. xiii. Nos. 2 and 3, Rome, 1710. Juvencius was not a contemporary, as the date of the publication of his work will show; but as I have been unable to find any other more contemporary account of Mettam's imprisonment, I have been obliged to follow his. I am, indeed, aware that it has been asserted that Weston was the first to introduce a rule at Wisbeach; but as I have always found this assertion accompanied with a perfect silence regarding Mettam, I have still found no reason for relinquishing Juvencius.

director of their principal studies, and indeed a kind of superior over the whole institute.

Unfortunately, Bagshawe, too, one of the chief fomenters of discord at the English college at Rome, had been added to their number, as well as another person, a medical practitioner, both being men who preferred a so-called independence to the easy mortification of a systematic rule of life. If these persons chose to stand apart and refuse to join the others, they might have done so. The work was voluntary, and so excellent that it was a pity to disturb it even by standing aloof. Yet this they might have done: there could be no compulsion. As, however, they united with the others, and thus formed one society, they were assuredly bound by its rules, and bound to promote its objects. Instead of this, they criticised and complained, and the peace of the community, it was evident, could not long continue. During Mettam's lifetime, indeed, they were awed into silence, but after his decease they openly broke the rules, carped at Weston's lectures, and succeeded in enticing several from the holy restraint so long and so fervently embraced.

When thus the community-life had been for some time in abeyance, twenty of the number, anxious to secure the fruits of sanctity and learning which they had already tasted, formed themselves into a second confraternity. During the breaking up of the first, they had felt the want of a superior appointed by a power greater than themselves. Yet, in that troubled period, such a power, within a distance available on sudden emergencies, scarcely existed. The missionaries, therefore, who were still at large, were accustomed, as long as Dr. Allen was president of Douay, to have recourse to him, the superior of the secular clergy, or, that being impossible, to men of such weight as Campion, Persons, and other Jesuits. To Father Garnet, then, the present superior of the Jesuits in England, the twenty priests, amongst whom were two Jesuits, naturally applied; and the more

naturally, because it was the wish of the new society to have Weston for their superior. Garnet acquiesced, and Weston reluctantly submitted.

The remainder, thirteen in number, were invited to unite in the easy observances thus established. The invitation was instantly rejected. It would perhaps have been most prudent, after this refusal, for the majority to have made some modification of their rule, in order that they might still meet at the common table, and thus preserve the forms as well as the substance of peace and brotherly love (A.D. 1595). Unfortunately, however, it was determined to keep the full extent of the rule; and the separation which resulted led for a time to a still greater alienation of mind. The mediation of some of those priests who were still at liberty happily terminated the difference, and led to the unanimous adoption of a new and more simple rule.

When a few years had passed, an unexpected incident began to open the eyes of all to the real character of some part at least of the late dissension. This was the apostasy of one of the disturbers of the community. Had, then, the minority been the unconscious tools of the government? It would certainly appear so. Walsingham was no more, but his arts were not forgotten: Bancroft, the Protestant bishop of London, was, as Camden plainly avows, fomenting by underhanded contrivances the dissensions, which that writer incorrectly terms a contest between the Jesuits and the secular priests. It is, at all events, a suspicious coincidence that one of the thirteen, probably a traitor before, thus went over to the bishop of London who had been so craftily at work, and, having apostatized, was retained in the bishop's household.*

Scarcely was peace restored to the confessors at Wisbeach, when dissension appeared in the English

* More; and Tierney's Dodd, vol. iii. pp. 43 and 44, and App. XX. "Inter media hæc certamina, sive serio, sive dolo malo, suscepta, quæ Londinensis episcopus subdole aluit," &c.—Cam. an. 1602, p. 845; More, lib. iv. No. 17.

college at Rome. As soon as Barrett, the president of Douay College, heard of it, he hurried from his own immediate charge to apply to the new evil some immediate remedy. He found, on his arrival in Rome, that Aquaviva, the general of the Jesuits, had resolved to abandon the direction of so indocile a community, but had thought it necessary, in the first place, to learn the opinion of Father Persons. Barrett, therefore, being anxious to shake his determination, lost no time in writing to Persons, to communicate to him the result of his own inquiries at the college.

On the death of Allen (he stated), some of its inmates had actually been intriguing for a successor to his dignity, and had likewise claimed for themselves an increase of privileges. Not succeeding, they began to murmur against the Jesuits, a few busy tongues suggesting that if the Jesuits were altogether removed, they could administer the college property, and while some enjoyed office and its emoluments, all could enjoy a more easy code of discipline. Thus, to Catholics, to young men who were preparing for the priesthood and for martyrdom, the motives now proposed were simply self-indulgence and ambition! Youth, quick in action, is slow in penetration. Those that were thus exciting others gave no time for reflection, but inflamed the imagination by exaggerated reports of what they called Jesuit interference in the general affairs of the mission.

Some, having come from England, professed to be intimately acquainted, not only with the conduct, but even with the motives of the Jesuits. One such there was who incurred a well-founded suspicion of being a Protestant informer. Others who thus talked were men whose intractable, turbulent character had earned a just expulsion from the college at Rheims.

Such was Barrett's account (April, 1596) of what he had ascertained by personal scrutiny. The rector had allowed the students, it appears, to become engrossed in external affairs, to the great detriment of study. All the speculations of the Catholic exiles

were greedily received and canvassed, and the Scottish and Spanish parties found their most impetuous, because most inexperienced, partisans within the walls of the Roman college. Such was the uncollegiate state of affairs when at last Persons himself arrived. He found, in addition to Barrett's account, that many of the students complained loudly that the Jesuits in their administration were by no means impartial, and quoted in anything but respectful terms his own late treatise upon the "Succession," in which he urged that every other branch of the English royal race should be put aside except that of Spain. Nothing, however, could withstand the personal influence of this gifted man. By his prudent firmness he quieted the minds of the students, and made the college at once the seat of earnest study and discipline (May, 1597). He sought to prevent future evils, by laying a more solid foundation of piety, and particularly by means of assiduous morning meditation.*

Father Persons had been invested by Aquaviva with a general superintendence over all the seminaries. He was now made rector of the college at Rome, and, with the Pope's assent, was confirmed in his former superintendence, with the title of "Prefect of the English Mission." This, indeed, was an increase, as well as a confirmation, of duties. He was thus superior not only of the colleges, but also of that portion of the English mission which had been intrusted to the Jesuits. All this was again confirmed, and its duties and modes of action clearly traced out, by Aquaviva, in an able, dignified instrument, worthy of the ruler of such a society (May 15, 1606).† When Persons went to any of the colleges, he was to appear as second to the actual rector. If complaints were brought to him, he was to send them, whenever possible, to the rector. If he saw anything that required amendment, he was to speak to the rector in private,

* Ap. More, l. vi. Nos. 1, 2, 10. See also the addit. papers in Tierney's Dodd, iii. App. Nos. 15 and 16.

† See it in More, l. vi. No. 9.

and with all kindness. In short, the wisdom and considerate spirit of the whole document would deserve the study of legislators.

Whilst in this arduous post, and lamenting the want of a noviciate for the growing wants of the mission, and for the great number of postulants, a noble legacy bequeathed by a Spanish lady to the Mother of God, under the administration of Father Persons and of his successors, enabled him to gratify his zealous desires, after repeated efforts, by the establishment of a house at Louvain (A.D. 1606).*

* More, l. vii. Nos. 2, 3, &c.; and l. viii. No. 8.

CHAPTER XVIII.

DESIRE OF SOME OF THE ENGLISH MISSIONARIES TO NOMINATE A HEAD PRIEST—GEORGE BLACKWELL IS APPOINTED ARCHPRIEST—APPEAL TO ROME—INTERVIEW OF BLUET WITH THE QUEEN—DOUBTS REGARDING THE SUCCESSION—STATE OF PARTIES—DEATH OF ELIZABETH AND ACCESSION OF JAMES—THE POPE'S ADVICE—THE PETITION OF THE CATHOLICS FOR TOLERATION—THE COUNTER-PETITION OF THE PROTESTANTS—THE MAIN AND BYE PLOTS MADE KNOWN TO GOVERNMENT BY CATHOLIC MISSIONARIES—FRESH SEVERITIES—MARTYRDOM OF SUGAR AND GRESWOLD.

The idea struck out at Wisbeach that an authorized chief was necessary for their little society, appears to have been felt by many in reference to the general state of the mission. Some thought, that instead of each of the missionaries labouring for his own plan of good, and being under no control, it would be better to form a voluntary association, with a head priest for the north, and another for the south, and various rules for admission or expulsion, as well as for appeals and punishments.

The scheme was drawn up, and, copies being sent to and fro, it received a number of signatures. Some, however, whilst they approved of its purpose, thought it impracticable,—thought that, being voluntary, men would withdraw from its jurisdiction at pleasure.

The question was evidently one of great importance, and had some years before, though in another form, presented itself to the acute mind of Father Persons. Whilst as yet on the English mission, he had written to his superiors, that "the necessity for a bishop was very great," for consecrating the holy oils, and for other duties. Indeed, at the very time that Persons and Campion were preparing to enter England, Dr. Goldwell, the last Catholic bishop of St. Asaph's, was actually on his way to this country. As he was

verging upon eighty, he could scarcely obtain the Pope's permission. When he had succeeded, and began to encounter the hardships of his long journey, his health gave way. He persevered, however, until, to the great joy of the seminary, he arrived at Rheims. Whilst devising the means for best promoting the good of the mission, a dangerous fever and great consequent feebleness made it evident, that the undertaking so heroically begun was now rendered impossible.*

When the desire of the English clergy for a superior became known, and was everywhere under discussion, Persons drew up a memorial containing nine express reasons why there should be two bishops appointed for England; and this he presented to the Pope and cardinals. That the measure might not be discarded for want of a decent revenue, he had secured even this, through the liberality of the bishop of Jaen.

Cardinal Allen, who at this time was still living, seems to have taken an opposite view: he thought that one priest should be delegated with extraordinary powers. This opinion, which Father Persons himself seems to have now adopted, was supported by a petition signed by some both of the clergy and of the more powerful laymen of the Catholic body. It was adopted.

The next step was to choose a priest for so important a position. Clement VIII., who was then Pope, could, of course, have at once appointed such a person, and have sent him with direct power from himself. As, however, the persecution always became more violent when any act seemed to emanate directly from the Pope, a more indirect plan was adopted. The votes of the priests in England were collected, as well as the circumstances of the times allowed; and a majority being for George Blackwell, he was proposed to Clement VIII., and soon after, by a letter issued at the especial injunction of the Pope by Cardinal Cajetan, the protector of England, he was appointed

* Concert. p. 70; More, l. iv. Nos. 17, 18, &c.; Chall.'s Mem. Sherwine, A.D. 1580.

the "superior of the English clergy," with the title and authority of "Archpriest." A chapter of twelve assistant priests was also appointed, one half being chosen by the cardinal protector, and the other half by the archpriest (March 7, 1598). The whole of Great Britain was then divided into twelve circuits, in order that the secular clergy of each circuit might be watched over by one of the "assistants." *

Thus, then, what had been so ardently desired was at least partially granted: a duly authorized superior was nominated, and the prudence of a chapter of equally authorized advisers was to guard him against the natural feebleness of any single mind.

The appointment of the archpriest was at once acceded to by the greater part of the English priests. Some, however, to the number of thirty-one, began openly to demur; and amongst them were Colleton, Mush, and other tried missionaries.

They objected to the appointment of the archpriest as a novelty, and to the rescript itself as being obtained by misinformation, and as being either uncanonical or unusual in form, emanating from a cardinal, and not directly from the Pope.

They, therefore, despatched some of their brethren to Rome, both to make an appeal and to learn distinctly the Pope's wishes. Had they simply acquiesced as soon as the cardinal's brief appeared, and calmly awaited the course of events, no principle would have been sacrificed, and peace would have been undisturbed. As it was, although the appeal seems to have been made with a safe conscience, it produced a printed controversy with its attendant bickerings.†

The archpriest thought the proceedings of the appellants unwarrantable, and, notwithstanding Mush's declaration that as long as the appeal was going on he

* "Speciali mandato nobis injunxit." The cardinal's letter in App. Tierney's Dodd, vol. iii. No. 22, p. cxx.; and extract from Birkhead's letter in Tierney's Dodd, vol. v. p. 49.

† Tierney's Dodd, iii. pp. 47 and 48 (notes); and App. Nos. 21, 22, 23, and 29; More, lib. iv. Nos. 18, 19, &c.

would never disobey his commands, he put the whole party under suspension. Their two delegates, meantime, soon after their arrival in Rome, were arrested, and were confined in separate apartments in the English college, under the care of Father Persons. After a detention of four months, they were released; and as the Pope had now confirmed the cardinal's brief, and as the appellants in England at once cheerfully acquiesced, there was a prospect of a perfect restoration of harmony (April 6, 1599). This prospect, unfortunately, soon vanished. The ocean heaves long after the storm has passed; but instead of awaiting patiently the subsidence of excited feelings, Blackwell most injudiciously, if we are to believe Colleton's narrative, closed his eyes to the appellants' submission, and required them to sign a letter which branded them with the crime of schism.

This charge being introduced against them in various ways, Colleton laid the case before the university of Paris, and requested their opinion: the answer was that they were not schismatics (May, 1600). Blackwell immediately forbade all ecclesiastics, under pain of suspension, to defend "in word or writing the censure of the university of Paris," and, a few months later, suspended both Colleton and Mush (Nov. 17, 1600). A second appeal,* signed by thirty-

* Tierney's Dodd, iii. p. 52, &c. (notes); and App. Nos. 23, 25, 27, 29, &c. Colleton's Just Defence (passim).

Colleton, however, a most vigorous, but not always dispassionate writer, seems to have omitted one very important circumstance. Some of his party, if not himself, demanded satisfaction for having been termed schismatics; and thus it was, as we learn from the Pope's calm summing up of the proceedings, that Blackwell renewed his charge of schism, and that the old wound was rent open afresh. "Pacem.....depositisque odiis et simultatibus, initam fuisse, magno nostro cum gaudio cognovimus. At vero quia nonnullorum animis adhuc hærebat offensio quædam, quod illi, qui primo tibi, fili archipresbyter, obtemperare recusaverant, schismatici à quibusdam esse censerentur, eâque de re satisfactionem aliquam sibi fieri postularent, tu, iisdem causis adductus, constitutæ authoritatis detractores videri tibi schismaticos fuisse, respondisti (quod dolentes referimus)," &c. —App. Tierney's Dodd, p. cl.

three clergymen, followed this sentence. Before this appeal was prosecuted, a brief arrived from the Holy See, full of sympathy and charity.* It commended those who had at once submitted to the archpriest, but exhorted them not to condemn others. It asked the others why they had not obeyed, why they had not believed the cardinal's letter; exhorted them to forgive and forget, and finally imposed upon them, and upon all others, "perpetual silence" upon these matters. It rejected their appeal, but suppressed an offensive treatise against them "on schism," as well as every other work written on the question; and forbade the very name of schism to be used by either party. It cautioned Blackwell to rule as a father, not for destruction, but for edification (August, 1601). Whatever may have been the too officious zeal of some of those who wrote against the appellants, the cause of the latter, right or wrong, received no small

* See his letter in Tierney's Dodd, vol. iii. App. No. 31, p. cxlvii. Tierney's note to this letter contains a grave charge against Persons' exactness in describing what he ought to have known. If all the passages referred to by Tierney do not appear to be quite conclusive, the charge, perhaps not of "infidelity," but of great occasional oversights and inaccuracy, may be admitted, and may at the same time be explained by the intensity of purpose for which Persons was remarkable. A well-meaning, but impetuous and naturally self-willed man, will sometimes strangely impose even upon himself. This is the character of Persons, as seems evident from his writings, no less than from some of his actions. His impetuosity, however, must have been generally under strong control, since he earns from the moderate and clear-sighted Father Oliver Manarie the praise of being "prudent." It must sometimes, on the other hand, have so far prevailed as not to allow time to weigh coolly the opinions of an opposite party, since the same father, in the same letter, declares that Persons was so eaten up with an "inveterate prejudice" against Morgan, Paget, and others of the Scottish party, that in stating facts connected with them, he could be "easily deceived in a considerable part of his narrative."—(See his letter of Sept. 18th, 1597, in Appendix to Tierney's Dodd, vol. iii. pp. xcvii. xcviii. and xcv.) It is always the case where party-spirit prevails, even where that party-spirit is intended to be subservient to nobler objects, so dangerous is it to attempt anything in politics under pretence of assisting religion. The reader may, perhaps, remind the writer to take out the beam first from his own eye.

damage from three especial circumstances. One of the most active of the party, as it was remarked at the time, was Bagshawe, who had earned an unpleasant notoriety, by having been engaged in the dissension in the English college, then in that at Wisbeach, and now in that of the nomination of the archpriest.

The second circumstance was the unusually free circulation of their writings; a freedom which, in that jealous reign, the press had never before enjoyed. The suspicion warranted by such a circumstance is confirmed by the third circumstance—the declaration of Bluet, one of the appellant priests, that he had had an interview with Elizabeth and her ministers (July, 1601). Would they have admitted him, and allowed him to go at large, unless they knew that he was working out their purposes? And were their purposes anything else but the overthrow of the Church? When a soldier goes, without being sent by his leaders, into the enemy's camp, no inquiry is made into his motives, or into the results of his private conversations; he is treated by all, upon the mere fact of his going, as a deserter. The fault or mistake of an individual cannot, however, be a reason for condemning his party: from Bluet's terming what he did "a plot," it would seem that he acted without the knowledge of the other appellants.

The final decision upon this second appeal, after a lengthened examination at Rome, was that Blackwell, by suspending and by making decrees, had exceeded his powers. He was enjoined, in order to prevent any new dissension "between the Jesuits and the appellants," not to consult the provincial of the Jesuits, or any others of that body; but, in all cases of difficulty, to apply to the Pope, through the cardinal protector. He was also enjoined to fill up the next three vacancies in his chapter from the ranks of the appellant priests. The whole controversy was to be consigned to oblivion. Everybody, clergy and laity, but especially the Jesuits and the appellants, were forbidden under pain of

excommunication to write any book on either side, or any other which might assail the good name of Catholics, or be likely to excite contention; as well as to ally themselves with heretics against Catholics, under any pretext or cause whatsoever (Oct. 5, 1602).*

Towards the close of Elizabeth's reign, the whole country became agitated by discussions upon the succession. Importuned by parliament to name the heir-apparent, Elizabeth had always sternly refused: she would not, she said, dig her grave whilst she was yet alive. The consequence was that, in their uncertainty, men began to speculate, and at last to form parties, with all their accompaniments of spies, secret correspondence, and intrigue. A few, guided by the will of Henry VIII., began to fix their eyes upon the Hertfords, the descendants of Mary Tudor, the younger daughter of Henry II. Others declared for the old hereditary laws of succession, by which the descendants of Margaret Tudor could alone inherit the crown. Of this latter class, however, some supported the claims of Arabella Stuart, descended from Margaret by a younger line; but others, and these an overwhelming majority, both amongst Catholics and Protestants, supported the right of James VI., the son of Mary, queen of Scots.

The ministry, in whose hands was the whole executive, likewise supported James, and took such measures on Elizabeth's death, that the Scottish king was soon in peaceable possession of the English crown. The Catholics had, hitherto, shared of course in the general perplexity: whilst the greater part were in favour of the Scottish, others formed what became known as the Spanish, party. Perceiving the uncertainty, the Pope had urged the Catholics to give their influence to those that would protect them in their religious freedom. That his object was merely to direct their choice as long as there was a reasonable doubt, seems evident from the two-fold fact that Garnet burnt the

* See brief in Tierney's Dodd, iii. App. No. 34, p. clxxxi.

brief as soon as the succession was actually established,* and that the Pope commanded the Catholics, as soon as he learned that there was political discontent amongst a few of them, to remain in perfect obedience to James.†

As long as there was a doubt of the succession, James was lavish of promises to all parties; and amongst the rest, to the afflicted Catholics, as well as to Catholic princes.

As soon, therefore, as he had made his public entry into his new kingdom, the Catholics presented him with a petition for toleration. They reminded him, in this address, of the losses and sufferings which "many noblemen and worthy gentlemen, most zealous in the Catholic religion" for the advancement of his "blessed mother's right unto the sceptre of Albion." They requested, not indeed equal rights with those of the established Church, but at least as much favour as the Puritans: "If our fault be like, or less, or none at all, in equity our punishment ought to be like, or less, or none at all." "We request no more favour at your grace's hands, than that we may securely profess that Catholic religion which all your happy predecessors professed, from Donaldus, the first converted, unto your majesty's peerless mother last martyred:—

"A religion venerable for antiquity, majestical for amplitude, constant for continuance, irreprehensible for doctrine, inducing to all kind of virtue and piety, dissuading from all sin and wickedness:—a religion beloved by all primitive pastors, established by all œcumenical councils, upheld by all ancient doctors, maintained by the first and most Christian emperors,

* So Coke declared on Garnet's trial, stating that it was Garnet's own admission.—See Coke's speech in "True and Perfect Relation," 1606.

† Tierney's Dodd, iii. App. Nos. 13 and 14; Camd. (end of Eliz.) Camden's account of James seems to be less worthy of confidence than that of Elizabeth, the former having been revised by James himself. Johnson's account is worthy of equal mistrust; his very words, indeed, both here and in many other places, remind us how closely he copies Camden.

recorded almost alone in all ecclesiastical histories, sealed with the blood of millions of martyrs, adorned with the virtues of so many confessors, beautified with the purity of thousands of virgins, so conformable to natural sense and reason, and finally so agreeable to the sacred text of God's Word and Gospel. The free use of this religion we request, if not in public churches, at least in private houses.

"We protest, before the majesty of God and all his holy angels, as loyal obedience and as immaculate allegiance unto your grace, as ever did faithful subjects in England or Scotland unto your highness's progenitors; and intend as sincerely with our goods and lives to serve you, as ever did the loyalest Israelites King David, or the trusty legions the Roman emperors."

The Protestants attempted to destroy the effect of this address, by a "Supplicatory Counterpoise." They might perhaps have saved themselves the labour and discredit of such a production: the cold and selfish heart of James never seems to have felt an indignant throb at injustice and suffering, never seems to have been moved, unless the injured cause of right coincided with the king's pecuniary or political gain.*

As soon as he found himself securely seated upon the throne of England, he found that to keep his promises, he must offend Cecil and the other members of the government. He was not the man to enter into a contest, or give up an atom of quiet, for the sake of principle. He disappointed both Puritans and Catholics, without earning the respect of the Anglicans.

One of those Catholics who had been most active in opposing the Spanish party, and promoting the

* See "The Catholics' Supplication" in Tierney's Dodd, vol. iv. No. 8, and Tierney's addition. Johnson professes to quote a considerable part of the supplication, but amplifies and changes at pleasure. If any one desires to learn thoroughly the character of the Protestant contemporary, or nearly contemporary, writers of the Reformation, he should study Maitland's Essays; Maitland being himself a Protestant clergyman, and the keeper of the Lambeth Library.

cause of James, was Watson, a missionary priest, who was bold enough to present himself before James, to remind him of his promises. Perceiving that the king had no intention to fulfil them, Watson ought to have turned his mind exclusively to his religious duties. He fancied, however, that he could promote the peace and good of his brethren by his own skilful use of circumstances. He forgot that the strength of a priest is in his direct vocation; and, turning from his path, perished in the quicksands of politics.

Some disappointed courtiers and Puritans—Grey, Raleigh, Cobham, and others—had formed a plot to seize the king. To strengthen their party by the accession of the Catholics, they made overtures to Watson. The latter seems to have thought that if, by a counter-plot, he could then rescue the king, the royal gratitude would thenceforth befriend the Catholics. He drew into his schemes another priest of the name of Clarke.

Whilst he was contriving his notable scheme, it was discovered by several parties, and amongst the rest by Father Gerard, and some other Jesuits. The latter informed Garnet, their superior, as well as Blackwell, the archpriest, who commanded them, as it was evident treason, to inform the government. Accordingly, Gage, a Catholic gentleman, and Francis Barnaby, a secular priest, informed Bancroft of London, whilst Father Gerard sent word to James by a Scotch Catholic, one of the king's servants, who, finding that it had become known the day before, made no communication.

Being well versed in the arts of his father and of Walsingham, Cecil allowed the conspiracy to ripen; but finding it abandoned, seized its promoters (A.D. 1603). One of these declared on his trial, that it was suggested by James himself, as a means of testing the loyalty of the young nobles. The chief agents were imprisoned; but George Brookes and the two missionaries, Watson and Clarke, suffered the death of traitors.* The former, when arrived at the scaffold,

* Stowe's Contin.; R. Johns. Rer. Britan. l. xi. pp. 372 and 376.

was so much more concerned for his sin than for the cruel death before him, that he expressed his wish that he had a life to forfeit for every one "whom he had by his treachery drawn into this treason."*

Soon after the arrest of the conspirators, James, as if in utter contempt of the loyalty which the Jesuits had so clearly proved, issued orders that all the sanguinary laws of Elizabeth should be enforced (Aug. 14, 1603). When his first parliament met, the penal code was not only confirmed, but was increased by a penalty of one hundred pounds for sending any one to a Catholic seminary, and by a statute disabling any one from inheriting, holding, or recovering, any kind of property, who either had resided, or should in future reside, in any college or seminary beyond the sea. If, however, such a person conformed to the Church of England, and proved this conformity by continuing to go to church, he was released from the legal disability, as long as he adhered to such conformity. Nor without a permission signed by six privy councillors, or by the king himself, could any captain of a vessel receive into his ship any passenger under the age of twenty-one years. As the missionaries often assumed the character of tutors, no one, henceforth, under the penalty of forty shillings a day, was to teach even the elements of grammar, without the bishop's permission. The person who engaged an unlicensed tutor, was to pay the same penalty as the tutor himself. One half of the penalty was to be the reward of the informer.

Royal proclamations were soon after despatched to all magistrates, requiring them not only to enforce the law, but to exact all arrears of the monthly payment of twenty pounds. This, like the other parts of

See also Garnet's letter in More, lib. vii. No. 30; and Tierney's notes, as well as the confessions of Watson and Copley, and extract from Gerard's MS. &c., in Tierney's Dodd, iv. p. 4, &c., and App. No. 1.

* Hardwicke's State Papers, i. (Sir Dudl. Carleton to John Chamberlain, Dec. 11, 1603), p. 387.

the code against Catholics, had been suspended in its operation; but now, was suddenly and rigorously enforced. Again were the pursuivants on the trail; again were the prisons filling, and the houses of the Catholics unsparingly ransacked, even sometimes at dead of night. To add to the mortification of the Catholics, no small proportion of the money of which they were thus unjustly stripped, was given to James's Scotch favourites.* In Herefordshire, the bishops of Llandaff and Hereford were notorious for their efforts to enforce the law. In a short time, no fewer, we are assured, than four hundred and nine families were stripped of everything. In the midst of the excitement thus produced, burial in the churchyard to a certain Catholic woman was refused. Yet, buried she must be, either there or on the road-side. Her friends, enraged at the indignity, and that too in a churchyard so lately wrested from the Catholics, buried her by force; and in proportion as the civil officers mustered to prevent them, so did they increase from the population around, until they had not only beaten off the police, but put the two bishops to flight, and seemed in a tone and attitude for any hostile movement. The efforts of the Catholic missionaries, and of the neighbouring Catholic gentry, allayed the gathering storm.†

The laws in other parts of the country were executed with almost equal rigour. John Sugar was condemned and executed at Warwick, for being "a seminary priest" (July, 1604). He was famed for his peculiar love of the poor, and had traversed on foot, in his missionary labours, a great part of Worcestershire,

* See a curious list which Lingard has extracted from the Book of Free Gifts, vol. vi. note to p. 29, 4to. ed. 1825. For the manner in which Catholics were to be "made profit of" by the courtiers, see Tierney's Dodd, iv. App. No. IX[a].

† Lodge's Illus. iii. No. 65, p. 293; Bartoli; stat. 1 Jac. I. c. 4; Stat. of the Realm, iv. The agitation that pervaded the Catholics, and yet, though with some difficulty, yielded to a sense of duty, is briefly but strongly described in one of Garnet's letters.—More, l. vii. No. 31.

Warwickshire, and Staffordshire. A young man, named Robert Grissold, was walking with him at the time of his arrest: he was detained, and tried at Warwick. Being asked by Judge Kingsland if he would go to church, he replied, "I will not, my lord. Then thou shalt be hanged, quoth the judge. I beseech you, my lord, let me have justice, and let the country know wherefore I die. Thou shalt have justice, I warrant thee, said the judge, and the country shall know that thou diest for felony. Wherein, quoth he, have I committed felony? Thou hast committed felony, saith the judge, in being in the company, in assisting and relieving a seminary priest that is a traitor. I have not therein committed felony, answered he. Then a justice of the peace said to him, Grissold, Grissold, go to church, or else, God judge me, thou shalt be hanged. Then God's will be done, quoth he. After that the judge asked him again if he would go to church? I have answered you, my lord, enough for that matter; I will not. Then thou shalt be hanged, said the judge. I crave no favour of you, my lord, in this action, answered he. What, said the judge in a great rage, dost thou crave no favour at my hands? No, my lord, said he, I crave no favour at your hands in this action." He was accordingly sentenced to death. Seeing a woman weeping, he asked her why she wept; it was a time to rejoice, and not to weep. The woman said she thought he would have had his life. "I do not want it now, said he; for I should be loath to lose this opportunity offered me to die; but yet God's will be done. Then a Catholic maid said, It is well said, friend Robert, for it is nothing to suffer death for so good a cause. Whereupon he said to the Catholics there present, Look, that ye all continue to the end."

"As he was going on foot to the gallows, one willed him to go a fair way, and not to follow through the mire Mr. Sugar, who was drawn on the sledge before him: to whom he made answer, I have not thus far

followed him, to leave him now for a little mire." They both died with equal cheerfulness.*

"Lovely and comely in their life, even in death they were not divided."

Two months after this execution, Lawrence Baily, a layman, suffered at Lancaster for the same offence as Grissold (Sept. 16, 1604). Two laymen of Yorkshire, and one of Northamptonshire, were in the following year put to death, for exhorting some of their neighbours to become Catholics † (Aug. and Sept. 1604).

* App. Chall. Mem. Miss. Priests, part ii. † Ib.

CHAPTER XIX.

THE GUNPOWDER PLOT—UNJUST ACCUSATION OF THE JESUITS—TRIALS AND DEATH OF FATHERS GARNET AND OLDCORNE, AND THEIR SERVANTS.

The Catholics in general met the renewal of this persecution under James with the same invincible patience with which they had sustained that of Elizabeth. One there was, however, a soldier by profession, who scoffed at patience as something little better than cowardice, and was agitating in his mind how to repel force by force. This was William Catesby, the champion of the Spanish party. He persuaded himself, and by degrees succeeded in persuading ten or eleven others, that it was in such a case a justifiable act of self-defence to repel the injustice which they were suffering, by destroying those that were thus trampling them down. They, therefore, devised the atrocious Gunpowder plot. How they were discovered, and how they perished, some in arms and others on the scaffold, is too well known to need a repetition. It was execrated by the whole body of Catholics, and was made known by Lord Monteagle, a Catholic, who had been cautioned to keep out of the way. It was equally execrated by Catholics upon the continent. One of the first to congratulate James upon his escape, and to take the opportunity to send him a costly present, was the king of Spain. Yet has it ever been termed, and too often maliciously termed, The Popish Plot.*

During the trial and examinations of the conspirators, it was evident that the government wished to brand the Jesuits with the charge of a full partici-

* Baker's Jas. I.

pation in the crime. In this it persisted, notwithstanding the absence of proof, and the emphatic denial of Sir Everard Digby, one of the youngest and most honourable of the infatuated band. Its first object, therefore, was to hunt down and bring to trial some of these devoted men. The king, in a public proclamation, did not blush to stigmatize the three Jesuits, Greenway, Garnet, and Gerard, with being all involved in the loathsome scheme. Garnet had succeeded Weston as superior, and had administered his office with equal zeal and prudence, for eighteen years. The other two were most efficient labourers in the mission.

Their hiding-place was betrayed by Bates, the servant of Catesby, and by Littleton, who was lying under sentence of death for having sheltered one of the conspirators. It was the residence of Mr. Abingdon, at Henlip, near Worcester. A government reward soon aroused the pursuivants, and a motley band of men, civil and military, as well as carpenters and masons, were soon clamouring for admission at the gates of Henlip. Having once entered, they posted sentinels at every turn and outlet, and ordered the workmen to test every part of the building. There were, we are told, "many hiding-holes in different parts. The access to some was through the chimney, to others through necessary-houses; others had trap-doors, which communicated to back staircases: some of these rooms on the outside have the appearance of great chimneys." * These contrivances were so admirably planned, that it cost the well-skilled pursuivants many hours to discover even the least important. In their search for those in which the Jesuits and their two servants, Owen and Ralph Ashley (called also Chambers), lay concealed, they were completely baffled.

Hunger, however, and the stench attending such a

* The words here quoted are those of Nash, in his History of Worcester. He was so struck by these hiding-places, and their peculiar effect upon the arrangement of the whole building, that he took the trouble to have an engraving of it in his work.

confinement, compelled the besieged to surrender. The two servants, who had had but one apple to subsist upon, emerged on the fourth morning from behind the wainscot of one of the galleries. It was not until the eighth day that Garnet and Father Oldcorne surrendered. Greenway and Gerard were not in the house: they had fled to the continent. The pursuivants, however, did not quit the house until the twelfth day. They then conducted their prisoners to Worcester, and finally to London.*

Again and again the latter were tortured by the rack; but as nothing could even thus be wrung from them, recourse was had to stratagem. Garnet's keeper affected to sympathize with his prisoner, and at last pointed out to him an opening, through which he would be able to converse with Oldcorne. Garnet seized the opportunity to make his confession, after which the two friends indulged for a while in conversation. Little did they think that there were spies in the hollow of the wall between them. In the course of their conversation, Garnet said that he felt secure with regard to the plot, there being but one person whose testimony could touch him; meaning that something had come to his knowledge, but only under the seal of confession.

This was all that the disappointed spies could carry to their employers; and scanty and vague as it was, it was made the ground of a charge of being accomplices in the plot (March 28, 1606). Oldcorne was sent for trial to Worcester; but Garnet was arraigned at the Guildhall. The public were prepared as usual by a variety of false reports: amongst others, Garnet was said to have gone out of his mind. His appearance on his trial dispelled at once many of these illusions, so firm and calm was his demeanour. The king himself, and several of the foreign ambassadors, were present.

* Compare More, lib. vii.; the "True Discovery" in Butl. Hist. Mem. App. note, iii. p. 444 (1821); Chall.'s Mem. part ii. App.; and Lingard.

Cecil, now earl of Salisbury, and other noblemen and royal ministers, took their places amongst the judges. Sir Edward Coke, the attorney-general, instead of clearly stating the accusation and its proofs, poured out a general invective against the Catholics, and particularly against the Jesuits. He raked up every charge which had been invented against them during the previous reign, and, amongst other irrelevant topics, introduced a distorted view of the Jesuit opinion of equivocation. The object of all this was but too evident: the trial was not intended to discover the exact truth as far as the facts rendered it possible, but to bring odium upon the Jesuits. Hence the various topics, and the appeals to prejudice, on the part of Coke.

Having at once to reply to so discursive a speech, Garnet first rebutted Coke's statements of doctrine; showing that he had misunderstood the meaning of equivocation, and still more its use, which was never lawful in matters of faith, in contracts, before judges properly constituted, or in any way that might redound to the injury of others. Having replied to the other charges made in general, Garnet turned at last to the charges made directly against himself. So far from being a traitor, he had procured from his superior a mandate which severely interdicted all political agitation; he had been praised by the Pope for his vigilance in suppressing the commotion in Herefordshire and other places; and he was under obedience to his superior never to meddle with public affairs.

He had been repeatedly interrupted, but at last Salisbury started to his feet; with tone and countenance that betrayed his vexation poured out reproaches upon him and his religion; and concluded by informing him that he had a witness of his conversation with Oldcorne. When Coke had added another invective to that of Salisbury, Garnet was allowed to reply.

What he knew, had been divulged to him in con-

fession, and permission to speak about it had been given by the penitent only in two cases; first, in case the matter confessed should become known by other means, and, secondly, in case he himself should be seized. The earl of Northampton here deduced two inferences: that Garnet, by not hindering had consented, and that he considered his own exemption from torments of greater moment than the safety of the entire kingdom.

To this Garnet replied, that as to hindering, he had done his utmost: being under the seal of confession, which Catholics hold it the height of sacrilege to violate, he was unable to speak to those who could have hindered it. With regard to preferring his own safety to that of the entire kingdom, he could not commit evil that good might come of it: the penitent's intention alone could release him from secrecy. For the sacrament of Penance being intended for the good of the penitent as well as the salvation of the whole Church, its secrecy was essential and inviolable: its violation would destroy both respect for the sacrament and its very use: "who would confess, unless certain of secrecy?"

After other remarks on both sides, in which nothing whatever was elicited, the jury returned a verdict of guilty. Nothing had been proved but Garnet's knowledge of the fact; a kind of knowledge which his conscience forbade him to reveal. Yet for this he was found guilty: certainly then he died for conscience' sake. If, misunderstanding what he meant regarding equivocation, the judges could not trust his word, that assuredly was no reason for his condemnation: no man is bound to criminate himself; and if proofs of fact are wanting, he ought to have been acquitted. Such proofs were in every respect wanting, except in the fact already mentioned of knowledge imparted in confession: for retaining that knowledge, therefore, was it that Garnet was found guilty. He was a martyr, therefore, for conscience, and for fidelity to the seal of confession.

Out of confession it seems that he knew nothing. Suspicions, indeed, he had, from the violent tone of Catesby; but no one, surely, is bound to become an informer on mere suspicion. Yet, even so, Garnet exerted himself to quell any inclination to sedition by procuring from the Pope a command that the Catholics should "not presume to move," and by communicating to Catesby and others this express injunction. As usual when men wish to find a pretext for disobedience, those whom Garnet suspected most, replied that the Pope had received his information from timid persons, and would have spoken very differently had he known the real misery in which the Catholics were plunged.

Such, then, was Garnet's trial; such the proofs; such the real amount of his knowledge; such his real conduct. He was a man of peace and loyalty, who had been greatly instrumental in quelling tumults both in Herefordshire and Wales, and strove as far as he could to hinder the treason, which he only suspected. Conscious of all this, he might well remind his unjust judges that the day would come when he and all that court would again meet, and his cause be again tried, not by fallacious conjectures and ill-founded arguments, but by the voice of conscience, before the tribunal of Christ.

With the same calm, intrepid spirit, he mounted the scaffold, prepared in St. Paul's Churchyard. Nothing daunted by the gibbet, and the blazing fire, into which his intestines were to be thrown, he civilly and cheerfully saluted the multitude, that gazed upon him from street and window, and every available place. Then, referring to the festival of the day,—the Invention of the Holy Cross, he expressed his joy that on such a day he was, for the sake of Christ, to lay down all the crosses of this changeable life, together with life itself. "For what other day could I rather desire than that on which the commemoration of the death and cross of Christ is most solemn throughout the whole of the Catholic Church? Many of you

know why I am now to die. It is because I would not reveal a circumstance told in confession; in which, although I have not sinned against God, yet I see the king is very much offended, which grieves me exceedingly. Nevertheless you ought to be informed, that such is our reverence for the sacrament, that we cannot on any account speak of the sins which have been mentioned in it, unless where and when the penitent himself has given permission. In one thing, perhaps, I may have offended; that suspicions elsewhere excited I repressed in silence, striving, meantime, in various ways, to quiet the minds and to anticipate the schemes of the turbulent. I was deceived; but for this silence I crave pardon." Some one here exclaimed, that Catesby had explained to him his intention out of confession, and that he had the proof of this in Garnet's own handwriting. "Show my handwriting," replied Garnet, "and if it is indeed mine I will not deny it. Yet certain am I that you can produce nothing of the sort." The man put his hand into a bag, but instead of bringing anything out, asked a servant where it was, who said, At home. "Indeed," said Garnet, "you have it not, either here or at home."

He exhorted all to keep their souls in patience, and refrain from plots. He asked God to bless the king and royal family, and to bless all the multitude, and make them Roman Catholics, since to none else was the kingdom of heaven open. Being now stripped to his shirt, which was long and carefully sewn together, he repeated the antiphon and versicle in the office of the day: "We adore Thee, O Christ! and we bless Thee, because by Thy cross Thou hast redeemed the world. This sign of the cross shall be in heaven when the Lord shall come in judgment: Alleluia." Having then said a hymn to the Blessed Virgin, and exclaiming repeatedly, "Into Thy hands I commend my spirit," he was cast from the ladder, but contrived to keep his hands crossed upon his breast (May 3, 1606). The executioner immediately approached to cut him down, and butcher him alive, but was deterred by the

shouts of the crowd until his victim had ceased to live.*

When at last his head was held up to the people, there were none of the usual shouts: the crowd dispersed in silence. The head was afterwards fixed up on London Bridge. To the surprise of the passers-by, it retained its fresh colour and venerable aspect. The news ran through the town, and for twenty days multitudes flocked to gaze upon it. Not less surprising was what was told, apparently by trustworthy witnesses, of the manner in which some drops of his blood, which had fallen upon the head of a stalk of straw, arranged themselves into a minute but distinct resemblance of Father Garnet, the features, beard, and neck, being all exactly formed to his likeness.†

Oldcorne, Garnet's fellow-prisoner, was, meantime, led to Worcester. In the neighbourhood of that city, and in the adjoining counties, he had laboured for many years, with great fruit. It will be well worth our while to pause for a moment over his past career.

Once being unable to obtain the conversion of a lady obstinate in error, he added fasts, watchings, and bodily afflictions to his prayers. He converted her, but so enfeebled his own constitution that he broke a blood-vessel, and produced a cancer in his mouth. Physicians told him that the only remedy for the latter was to remove some of the bones. This he refused, fearing to lose the power of preaching.

In this state he thought of St. Winefrid, to whom he had a great devotion, and to whom, indeed, as a martyr to virginity, there had always been a great devotion in England and Wales, but especially in the valleys of the Dee and the Severn. To this great saint, of whom history is almost silent, Oldcorne had recourse in his affliction. He began a pilgrimage to her far-famed spring at Holywell. That spring, tra-

* More, l. vii. Nos. 23—33, and 35; Chall. part ii, and App. to same; Jard. State Trials, ii.

† See the two depositions in More, vii. No. 35.

dition always asserted, had gushed forth as soon as her head fell to the ground. It had been the resort of pilgrims innumerable; and even to this day the stately groined stonework that overhangs it, tells of ages when England and Wales were Catholic. Thither journeyed the victim of missionary zeal. Nor did he journey in vain: with earnest prayers to the saint, he put into his mouth a stone brought by a priest from the well, and in one half-hour the pain ceased, and the wound dried and healed. Then, arriving at Holywell, he bathed, and was restored to his former health and vigour. More, himself a contemporary, tells us that "Father Gerard testifies that he received the account from Oldcorne himself, a little before he fell into the hands of the persecutors, and also from the priest who gave him the stone from the well." *

After a life thus devoted to the salvation of souls, and thus marked with wonders, not to say miracles, this zealous missionary was brought to Worcester from the Tower, to fertilize with his blood the field of his labours. He was accused of having concealed and succoured Father Garnet, when proclaimed a traitor; and with having approved of the plot, at least after its discovery. He replied, that it was true that he had not revealed where Garnet lay, but that he could see no crime in such concealment. With regard to the plot, he denied that he had ever expressed either approval or disapproval of it. No proofs could be produced, but, as a matter of course, he was condemned to the death of a traitor. He was executed more that three weeks before Garnet (April 7, 1606).

With him died three others, of characters in every way dissimilar: a thief whom he had converted and received into the Church the day before; Littleton, who had turned informer against him, but now asked his pardon, and declared aloud his innocence; and

* More, vii. No. 36. More was born in 1586, and died 1661. Gerard died at Rome in 1630. Dr. Oliver gives him a just eulogium for "patient zeal" and "extraordinary tact and prudence" ("Collections"). See Appendix DD.

Ralph Ashley, who was put to death for no reason whatever, but for being his servant. All three died as became Christian penitents; but Ralph with the cheerfulness of a Christian hero. He kissed the print of Oldcorne's feet, as his master stepped upon the ladder, exclaiming: "What a happiness to have been the servant of such a master! After being taught by him to lead a good life, I shall finish life along with him by so blessed a death."*

John Owen, or Little John, the servant of Garnet, was already dead. He had been long afflicted with a rupture, but, nevertheless, was put to the rack. Being a second time stretched upon it, his bowels poured out upon the ground, and he soon after expired. He was famous for the skill with which he contrived hiding-places for the priests. †

* More, vii. No. 36, and to the end; Chall. part ii. and App.; Jardine, ii. p. 232.

† Ib. No. 27; also Oliver's Collections, Owen (as mentioned by F. Gerard).

CHAPTER XX.

A ROYAL PROCLAMATION AGAINST THE CLERGY: ITS INVIDIOUS DISTINCTION—THE DECLARATION OF SOME OF THE CLERGY—THE "ACT FOR THE BETTER DISCOVERING AND REPRESSING OF POPISH RECUSANTS"—THE "ACT TO PREVENT AND AVOID DANGERS," ETC.—ATTEMPTED DISTINCTION BETWEEN "PAPIST" AND "CATHOLIC"—VOLUNTARY EXILE OF MANY—FERVOUR—THE POPE'S ENVOY TO JAMES—HIS LETTER CAUTIONING THE CATHOLICS AGAINST THE "RITES" OF HERETICS, CONDEMNING THE OATH, AND EULOGIZING THE ENGLISH "MARTYRS"—HOLTBY—DRURY—THE POPE'S SECOND LETTER UPON THE OATH—DEPRIVATION OF BLACKWELL—BIRKHEAD BECOMES ARCHPRIEST—SIGEBERT BUCKLEY—MARTYRS—ANTONY DE DOMINIS.

THE late conspiracy, denounced and execrated as it was by the whole Catholic body, was made a pretext for new rigours, and for a new and ensnaring oath. To understand more exactly these new enactments, it will be necessary to revert to the close of the late reign. Before the death of Elizabeth, whilst some of the secular clergy were hesitating to acknowledge the authority of Blackwell, the archpriest, and whilst Bancroft of London was labouring, unseen, to produce a schism, Elizabeth, as if to collect the fruit of his cunning, had issued another of her edicts, to command, on the one hand, the religious, and all secular clergy "adhering to them," who did not choose to make a profession of "duty and allegiance," to quit the kingdom within thirty days; and to command, on the other, that all the rest of the secular clergy that were then at large, should leave the country within two months, or at most by February the first, unless they made profession of their "duty and allegiance" (Nov. 5, 1602).*

* Camd. 1602, p. 845. See the proclamation in Tierney's Dodd, iii. App. No. 35. According to the queen's proclamation, those who adhered to the Jesuits were "almost all the secular priests."

The clause, to make a profession of allegiance, probably meant no more than that they should submit to the terms already again and again dictated. Some, however, thought it a fit opportunity to endeavour to soothe her majesty, by making as full a profession of allegiance as conscience would allow.

They, therefore, drew up a document, in which they declared that, "whereas it hath pleased our dread sovereign lady to take some notice of the faith and loyalty of us, her natural-born subjects, secular priests (as it appeareth in the late proclamation), and of her prince-like clemency to give a sufficient earnest of some merciful favour towards us,"—we, "prostrate at her majesty's feet, do acknowledge ourselves infinitely bound unto her majesty therefore." They then proceeded to acknowledge that Elizabeth was their lawful sovereign, having no less authority than any of her predecessors; that in all civil matters they would obey her as far as Christian priests in any Christian land were bound to obey their temporal prince: and that as conspiracies and invasions had been made under pretence of restoring the Catholic religion by the sword; and as by these "violent enterprises, her majesty, otherwise of singular clemency towards her subjects, hath been greatly moved to ordain and execute severer laws against Catholics," they protested that they would defend her, and persuade all Catholics to defend her, against all hostile attempts whatsoever, notwithstanding any excommunication, past or future. Having thus satisfied, as they thought, all reasonable claims upon their temporal allegiance, they added that "as there will not want such as will condemn and misconstrue our lawful fact; yea, and by many sinister suggestions and calumnies discredit our doings with the Christian world, but chiefly with the Pope's holiness," they might be allowed to add to their acknowledgment of the queen's right, an equal acknowledgment of what was due to the Holy See; that, in short, they acknowledged the Pope to be the successor of St. Peter, with as "ample authority and

spiritual jurisdiction over all Christians," as that Apostle possessed.

This document was signed by thirteen priests, and amongst others by Dr. Bishop, John Colleton, John Mush, Francis Barnaby, and Anthony Champney, and by Roger Cadwallador and Robert Drury, two missionaries who were afterwards put to death. It was presented to the queen and privy council. No notice appears to have been taken of it: the persecution continued as before; and if, as it said, the queen expressed some satisfaction, it was a satisfaction that led to no result, except perhaps, that the thirteen subscribers may have owed to it, during the few surviving months of the queen's life, their exemption from a prison.*

To censure the subscribers of this document, may appear presumptuous. Yet that which mars a perfect work, is often more deserving of express notice, than the glaring faults of that which has no essential beauty. The men who signed the declaration, were exemplary missionaries. If they sought some relaxation in the penal code, they sought what was not only for their own convenience, but for the general good of religion. Yet they were soldiers standing foot to foot with their enemies. Those enemies were not only the powers of darkness, but all who passed or enforced the laws against the Catholic Church; and yet these were enemies, only inasmuch as they thus resisted God's Church. With these, the struggle had been maintained for half a century. To preach, to administer the sacraments freely but warily, or to die, was the missionary's part. His soul and his tongue were untied, while his limbs were bound and tortured. His priestly power remained, but often shrouded in the filth of a dungeon, in the shame of a convict's dress, and of a death on the gallows. Thus in patience and prayer, he contended with worldly power and craft. When, at last, his enemy held out a flag of truce, his

* Tierney's Dodd, iii. p. 55, and App. No. 36.

reply ought to have been as manly, as freespoken, as generous, as the hardy soldier's. Was it so in the declaration of the thirteen priests? Is the expression "prostrate at the feet" of our dread sovereign lady, the tone of an Englishman's address to the throne? Was it at least generous, thus to notice, instead of scorning, a proclamation which reflected, most undeservedly, upon "the religious and those that adhered to them"? Did the facts of Elizabeth's reign, did her hanging up of thieves, sometimes by a summary court-martial, sometimes without any trial at all, to say nothing of Norfolk's death, or the executions of Puritans as well as most loyal Catholics, did all these facts corroborate the assertion that Elizabeth was of "singular clemency towards her subjects"? Alas! if there be something wanting in independence, something in generosity, and with shame be it said, something even of truth, is there not reason to fear that other soldier-like qualities likewise were wanting?

That the declaration, whatever be thought of its merits, did not satisfy Bancroft of London when he became archbishop of Canterbury, in 1604, is evident enough from an oath now issued, in the king's name, by authority of an act of parliament.

This act, a most grievous one for Catholics, deserves a careful study. Its spirit is revealed in its very preamble. "Forasmuch," it begins, "as it is found by daily experience, that many of his majesty's subjects that adhere in their hearts to the Popish religion, by the infection drawn from thence, and by the wicked and devilish counsel of Jesuits, Seminaries, and other like persons," therefore, the statute continues,—after declaring with a fearful contempt of all proof, that the Gunpowder plot was "undertaken by the instigation of Jesuits and Seminaries," "by their scholars taught and instructed by them to that purpose,"—therefore let it be enacted, that the old penalty of twelve pence per week for absence from church, if the charge be made within one month, shall continue; but that, if a Catholic even go to church, it shall

not be enough; he shall be compelled to go there to communion once every year, or pay twenty pounds the first year, double that sum the second year, and triple the third,* and continue to pay for any future year's omission, the same triple fine of sixty pounds. That no recusants might escape, the churchwardens and constables were to present the names of all such Catholics, as well as those of their children and servants, at the sessions, and their monthly absence, once every year.

Any Catholic once convicted of not going to church, was to forfeit, without any necessity for a second conviction, twenty pounds a month, for his whole life, until he chose to conform. The king was empowered to refuse the twenty pounds, and to seize two-thirds of all the leases, farms, tenements, and landed property of any Catholic proprietor.

To hunt the prey into the very toils, the Protestant diocesan, or any two justices within their own jurisdiction, could interrogate upon oath, not only those residents who had not received the Protestant communion twice within the previous year, but any traveller of the age of eighteen and beneath the rank of a nobleman.† If the resident or traveller refused to swear that he was not a recusant, that is, a firm Catholic, he was to be required to take a new oath of the following purport.

He was to declare that James was lawful king, and that the Pope had no kind of authority to depose him, or to authorize others to depose him, or to release his subjects from their allegiance. The person thus swearing, was moreover to declare that he would support the king, notwithstanding any excommunication or deprivation. After all this, he was to add:

* Bancroft, aided by Perkins, a fallen priest, is said by Goodman (according to Ant. Wood, Athen.) and others, to have been the contriver of this oath. Goodman was the Protestant bishop of Glouces-ter, but died a Catholic.

† A nobleman could be required to swear by the written and conjoint requisition of six privy councillors. The penalty of a refusal was a præmunire.

"And I do further swear, that I do from my heart abhor, detest, and abjure as impious and heretical, this damnable doctrine and position, that princes which be excommunicated by the Pope, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or any other whatsoever. And I do believe, and in my conscience am resolved, that neither the Pope nor any other person whosoever, hath power to absolve me from this oath, or any part thereof, which I acknowledge by good and full authority to be lawfully ministered unto me." "All these things I do plainly and sincerely acknowledge and swear," "according to the plain and common sense and understanding of the same words, without any equivocation or mental reservation whatsoever."

The greater part of this oath any Catholic would willingly take. Some expressions, however, were inserted which could not be reconciled with truth. If a Catholic from study and reflection became persuaded (to say nothing of the accuracy of his judgment) that in the case of an evidently tyrannical prince, it was better for the Pope to judge and depose him than for torrents of blood to be shed in civil war, how could he call this mature opinion, which he thought would save life without infringing principle,—how could he call it a "damnable doctrine"? If he thought (whether mistaken or not) that it was the best plan in the circumstances, the plan most according to the will of God, how could he call God himself to witness that it was "impious"? If he knew that there was no article of faith which it attacked, how could he say there was, or, what in other words is the same, how could he call it heretical? How, in short, could he declare that the oath was administered by "good and full authority," if he were convinced that it belongs to the Church only to pronounce what is impious, what heretical, and what damnable? Catholics know well, that truth is a fundamental virtue: without it where is faith itself?* For truth's sake, there-

* Dr. Milner, in his Supplem. Memoirs, remarks, quoting another

fore, they could not take such an oath. Still less could they when they saw or doubted that it trenched upon faith. Some, indeed, from want of consideration, consented, but the greater part rejected it with horror, as a new and crafty temptation. What, after all, was to be the lot of those (few as they were) that consented to take it? Were they allowed the privileges of unsuspected subjects? Not at all: they laboured under the same persecution as before. The only difference between them and other Catholics was, that those that refused the oath were arrested at once; and if men, and if they still, a second time, refused it, were subjected to perpetual imprisonment, and all the penalties of a præmunire; if they were women, they were shut up in the common gaol, until they chose to take it.*

The above-mentioned oath and penalties form the chief substance of what was entitled, "An Act for the better discovering and repressing of Popish Recusants." It was immediately, in the very same session of parliament, followed by a system of pains and penalties calculated to shut up every Catholic, if not in a dungeon, at least within certain prescribed limits, and there to bait him with spies and informers, and to make every important step in life—not only the practice of his religion, but his education and his marriage—a new means of adding to his afflictions. This new statute was entitled, "An Act to prevent and avoid dangers which may grow by Popish Recusants." Its preamble was characterized by about as much calmness and love of truth as that of the former statute. It began thus: "Whereas divers Jesuits, Seminaries,

celebrated theologian in support of his assertion, that "it is no less heresy to maintain an article to be of faith, which is not so, than it is to deny an article to be of faith which is really so." Now, continues the bishop, "what Christian Catholic heart does not palpitate and faint at the idea of swearing that St. Thomas of Aquin, St. Bonaventure, and a thousand other saints or holy doctors of the Church, lived and died *professing impious and damnable doctrine!*" (pp. 28 and 30, Lond. 1820).

* Stat. 3 Jac. I. c. 4.

and Popish priests, daily do draw many of his majesty's subjects" "to the Romish religion, and from their loyal obedience to his majesty, and have of late secretly persuaded divers recusants to commit most damnable treasons," &c.

To put some restraint, therefore, upon their "liberty to meet, consult, and plot their treasons and practices against the state," it was enacted that no one who had kept from church for three months was to be allowed to live in London, or within ten miles of it, if he had a dwelling-house elsewhere. This to the upper classes was almost equivalent to banishment, not only from all places of fashionable resort, but from court and parliament, and from the practice of the liberal professions.

This, however, as well as being deprived of arms and munitions, was little to what followed: every Catholic was now to be a prisoner at large; he was forbidden by the statute to go beyond five miles from his accustomed dwelling without a written permission signed by three privy councillors, or by four justices, with the assent of the bishop of the place, or of the lieutenant or deputy-lieutenant of the county. If even he had obtained this written permission, he was to be obliged to swear before any one of the four justices that he had "truly informed them of the cause of his journey," and that he would not "make any causeless stays." * When thus hampered, several prohibitions that followed would seem almost superfluous. The poor Catholic was forbidden to act in almost any civil capacity: he was not to be an attorney, a barrister, an executor, a tutor, a guardian, a magistrate, or a commissioned officer in the army. To be married out of a Protestant church or chapel disabled the husband from possessing any freehold as tenant

* Permissions of this kind are still extant, showing that the practice was as severe as the law. One of them is kept in the library at Oscott College. Nay, an unfortunate couple, unless within five miles of one another, could not accomplish an intended match without the cognizance of prying officials.—See one instance in Orthod. Journ. vol. i. 386.

in courtesy, and the wife from possessing anything from her husband's goods or lands, as dower, jointure, or widow's estate. If, however, the husband had married a woman without lands, he was to forfeit a hundred pounds, one half to the king, and the other to the informer. To have a child baptized by any other than the Protestant rite, subjected the person so doing to the penalty of a hundred pounds, of which one-third was to go to the king, one-third to the informer (no wonder the trade prospered), and one-third to the parish. Any one sending his child abroad for education was to forfeit one hundred pounds; any one who had reached his eighteenth year, and should have crossed the sea for education, was to forfeit all his property and inheritance to his nearest Protestant kinsman, unless he returned and took the new oath of allegiance, attended church, and received the Protestant communion. To be buried anywhere except in the Protestant churchyard, was punished with a fine of twenty pounds,—one-third for the informer. Any one who was the cause of a priest's arrest, or of the discovery of persons having been present at Mass, or of various other acts of recusancy, was to be rewarded with one-third of the fine or forfeited property, until that portion reached the amount of fifty pounds.

The very fact of having a Catholic Prayer-book was punished with a fine of forty shillings for every such book, and the book itself was to be burnt. Justices, mayors, and other local authorities, might search for altars, books, pictures, "or such-like Popish relics." If a crucifix were found, it was to be defaced at the general quarter sessions; "and the same so defaced to be restored to the owner again"! In Japan, at this very time, it was a pagan's triumph if he could so terrify a Christian as to make him trample upon the image of redemption. In England, it was the triumph not only of an individual, but of the law and legislature, not merely to trample upon, but publicly to deface, that very image of redemption!

When these atrocious bills had passed the Lords,

they were despatched to the Commons, as the journals emphatically testify, "with special recommendation." The Commons received them, wrangled over them, and added amendments in the same bitter spirit, until they were completed; the first bill passing "with great applause," according to their journals, "and a general voice of prayer that it may have good success;" and the amendments in the second bill, especially that for bringing up Catholic children as Protestants, passing in their third reading "with the like applause" (May 27, 1606).*

Whilst thus casting upon the whole Catholic body the meshes of a hundred laws, the government endeavoured to draw a distinction between those Catholics that were zealous for everything emanating from the Holy See, and the rest of their body (June 18, 1606). It was its desire to limit to the latter only, the term Catholic, whilst it designated the former as Papists, a name intended to be a stigma, whilst in reality it was a badge of fidelity to St. Peter's chair.

Whatever the merit or demerit of the measures of government, it no longer displayed the stern consistency of the days of Elizabeth; but this very want of consistency in the royal councils, the very fact that the king's proclamations were sometimes dilating, and sometimes contracting in their denunciations, made them for a time the more terrible as they became more indefinite. Many of the Catholics, therefore, escaped the rigour of the laws by a voluntary exile; and of these, some were so far advanced in years, that it was evident that all that they sought was a peaceable deathbed in a foreign land.

With regard to those that remained, Boderie, the French ambassador, declares that their fervour and zeal surpassed all that he had ever seen or imagined. He was particularly struck with the exemplary behaviour of ladies of quality. There were few of that class in the whole nation who were not Catholics; nor

* 3 Jac. I. c. 5; Journ. of L.; and J. of Com. i. p. 315.

was there one of these Catholic ladies who did not keep a priest concealed in her house for the benefit of others as well as herself.*

Whilst the Catholics were as yet considering the purport of the new oath, and some few, amazed at the penalties for not attending the Protestant services, were reviving almost-forgotten discussions upon that point, Pope Paul V., who had been cardinal-protector of the English mission, full of compassion for his suffering children in England, made the only effort in his power to mitigate the fury of the new statutes. He sent his chamberlain, the Baron de Magdelene, to carry a letter to James, assuring him of the obedience of the Catholics, of his own good-will, and of his regret and horror for the late conspiracy. This messenger being the son of one of the duke of Lorraine's counsellors, travelled to England as if in the duke's service. He was received with some consideration, as the payment by the king of his expenses at his lodgings, as well as a parting gift of ten or twelve hundred crowns, sufficiently prove. The persecution, however, instead of relaxing, became more intense than before.†

Baffled in this attempt, the Pope endeavoured to console and animate the afflicted Catholics. After expressing his sympathy, however, he expressly cautioned them that "to go to the churches of the heretics," or "to hear their sermons, or to communicate with them in their rites," would be injurious to their own souls and to God's worship. "The oath," he told them, "contains many things which are plainly adverse to the faith and to salvation." From the alacrity with which they had hitherto suffered privations and death, he doubted not that they would bear their new trials with that same fortitude, "which is

* Letter to Villeroi, July 1st, 1606, in the "Ambassades de Bod." vol. i. p. 161, &c. "La plupart des dames de qualité sont Catholiques," &c. (p. 162).

† Compare the letters of Villeroi and Boderie, 20th and 28th August, 1606, and September 9, pp. 283, 300, and 327.

no less resplendent," he added, "in these latter times, in your martyrs, than it was in the first ages of the Church." "Stand, therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breastplate of justice." "Taking the shield of faith, be strengthened in the Lord, and in the power of his might," "rooted and founded in charity." We, meantime, will never cease to implore the Father of Mercies to look down in his clemency upon your afflictions and labours (Sept. 22, 1606).*

The Pope's brief was delivered first to Holtby. This priest, after years of zealous missionary labour, had become a Jesuit, and had succeeded Garnet as superior. He was on the English mission altogether for considerably more than half a century, and yet so contrived to conceal his priestly character, by his love of poor apparel, by his skilful construction of hiding-places, and perhaps, moreover, by his remarkably broad shoulders, that during the whole time he was never in the hands of the pursuivants. As soon as the obnoxious oath had appeared, Holtby prudently forbade the Jesuits to discuss it, and sent a copy to Rome. Receiving now the Pope's brief, he lost no time in communicating to Blackwell, the archpriest, what he had thus received. The latter showed it to some of his friends, but seems to have taken no steps to make it known to the clergy.

The Protestants, meantime, were busily administering the new oath. Among those that fell into their hands at this very time, was Drury, one of the priests who five years before had signed the abortive declaration of allegiance. To him the new oath was tendered, and as promptly rejected (Feb. 6, 1607). As he was known to be a priest, he was condemned; but life was now offered him, if he would take the oath. "He chose," says the Douay Diary,† "rather to die than

* See it in More, lib. viii. No. 3.

† Quoted by Chall. (Mem. Miss. Pr. part ii.); More, l. viii. No. 4. Boderie, who was watching every opportunity of assisting the Catholics, found it hopeless to intercede for Drury. Many letters and

to act against his conscience." "Which was the case also of several other priests, who suffered during this reign, who refused to save their lives by taking an oath which they judged to contain a falsehood." Drury died at Tyburn.

The oath thus heroically rejected, was not without its busy advocates, who ceased not to assert that the Pope was not fully informed, and that the brief was to be considered not so much his production as that of the Jesuits.

To put an end to all doubt, the Pope issued another brief "to the English Catholics." Some of the Catholics, he said, after his previous declaration that they could not take the oath with a safe conscience, had, he was informed, dared to assert, that that declaration and command was not from his own conviction and wish, but from the contrivance and instigation of others, and the said Catholics had, therefore, advised that no attention should be paid to the declaration. This account has indeed troubled us; and the more because we expected obedience from those who were generously renouncing wealth, dignity, liberty, and life for obedience to our see. Attributing, therefore, what has happened, not to your own will so much as to the craft of the enemy of our salvation, we again write to you, and signify to you that what we wrote was from our own heart, and with most certain knowledge, and after long and serious deliberation upon all its contents. You are, therefore, in every way bound to observe it, without regard to any interpretation to the contrary. We entreat Him to enlighten you, who has confided to our lowliness the care of His flock. We beg of Him to keep you in faith, constancy, and mutual charity and peace. To all of you with the

other papers from Rome, he states, were found in his possession, and caused his death [he should have said his condemnation, life being afterwards offered him]; a letter from F. Persons, he adds, being the real cause. For if he had but a copy of the Apostles' Creed from Rome or the Jesuits, he continues, I could not obtain his pardon, so great is the hatred for Rome and the Jesuits.—See Boderie's letter of March 10, 1607, vol. ii. p. 102, &c.

utmost affection and charity, we give our blessing (Aug. 23, 1607).*

A little before this brief arrived, Blackwell himself, now a prisoner for the faith, had taken the oath. He had before vehemently opposed it, refusing the counsels of Mush, Holtby, and others, to remain silent until the Pope's decision could be obtained. Having now rushed into the contrary extreme, he was deaf alike to the remonstrances of Bellarmine and Persons, or even to the voice of the Vicar of Christ (Nov. 1607). Such being the conduct and declaration of the archpriest, it is no wonder that many of the upper classes took the oath. Many of the secular clergy, however, as well as all the Benedictines and the Jesuits, with a great part of the laity, rejected it with horror. In punishment of Blackwell's taking the oath, he was, in the course of a few months, deprived by the Holy See of his office of archpriest, and "of all faculties, by whatever authority obtained" (Feb. 1, 1608); George Birkhead being appointed archpriest in his place.†

The Pope's second brief upon the oath had, meantime, strengthened the great body of the Catholics in their obedience to the Holy See, but did not prevent a small number from persisting in their defence of the oath. Father Preston, alias Widdrington, had vehemently opposed, and now as vehemently defended, the oath. As he had changed sides on an important question some few years before, his present undutiful conduct could have but little influence. The blood of martyrs was speaking more cogently to the Catholics, than the clever distinctions of Father Preston.

Amongst those who, after being condemned for being priests, had refused to save their lives by taking the oath, was Matthew Flathers, a native of Weston, in Yorkshire. He was executed at Micklegate, York. "He was no sooner turned off the ladder, but immediately cut down, and rising upon his feet, attempted

* See it in More, lib. viii. No. 5, or Tierney's Dodd, &c.

† See briefs and the letters of Mush and others in Tierney's Dodd, vol. iv. App. No. 24, &c.

to walk, as one half-stunned; but one of the sheriff's men quickly stopped his journey, by giving him a desperate cut on the head with his halbert; another violently flung him down, and held him fast while the executioner ripped up his breast, pulled out his heart, and so completed the butchery" (March 21, 1608).*

Three months after the death of Flathers, Thomas Garnet, a Jesuit, being led to the scaffold at Tyburn, had the oath of allegiance proposed to him by the earl of Exeter, with the assurance that the king would grant him his life if he took it. It was urged, too (untruly indeed), that several of his order had taken it; and that amongst the most learned, it was a matter of doubt and discussion. That is the very reason, replied their victim, why I cannot swear it as a thing certain: no, not if I had the offer of a thousand lives. Then, kissing the gibbet, thanking God for what he repeatedly termed his good fortune, in having to suffer, and praying for all his persecutors, he delivered himself cheerfully to death (June 23, 1608).†

The following year is remarkable for being the first from 1580, in which no Catholic blood was shed for religion. The next year (1610) saw the death of the last surviving monk of Westminster Abbey, Sigebert Buckley. He was in his ninety-third year, and had suffered forty years' imprisonment for the faith.‡

In the same year, Roger Cadwallador, one of those who, in 1602, had signed the proposed oath of allegiance, was discovered and arrested in a house about eight miles from Hereford. After various examinations before Bennet, the Protestant bishop, and others, he was condemned for being a priest.

* Widdrington's New Year's Gift, as quoted by Tierney, iv. p. 76; Chall. Mem. part ii.; Birkhead to Card. Bubalis, in Tierney's Dodd, iv. No. 32.

† More, l. viii. No. 8.

‡ Chall. Mem.; Baker's Chron. Jas. I. p. 510, ed. 1674. Buckley was the connecting link between the Benedictines of old and those of modern times, having given the habit to the English Benedictines who had been professed abroad.—Reyner's Apostolatus, tract i. sect. 3, p. 247, Douay, 1626.

At the time fixed for his execution, says the contemporary account of his death, "the under-sheriff came, accompanied among others with the executioners, who were a couple of masons, clad in long garments all in black, and their faces covered with the same, which made them look ugly and dreadful. The champion of Christ nothing daunted at the sight, at his first coming out of the doors, cheerfully viewed all the company, demanding what was to be done? The under-sheriff made answer: Nothing, sir, if you please; for if you will but take the oath of allegiance here, you may save us labour, and yourself much pain: which he constantly refusing to perform, the under-sheriff replied that then he was to die." Arriving "within sight of the gallows, and the block whereon he was to be quartered, they showed him these and other instruments of death, leading him between two great fires, the one prepared to burn his heart and bowels, the other to boil his head and quarters: and thinking the sight of these did somewhat terrify him, they promised him once more that none of them should touch him, if he would take the oath." He refused; but as some gentlemen pressed him, he replied that he was willing to declare that James was his lawful king, and to swear to him all true allegiance. This the gentlemen loudly applauded, urging him to proceed with the rest of the oath. "No," said the martyr, "there is secret poison in the sequel." He suffered at Leominster (Aug. 1610).

Other martyrs had the same offer of life, on condition of taking the oath; but with the same constancy refused. Amongst them was John Roberts, the first Benedictine monk who came into England to share the toils and dangers of the Jesuits and secular priests (A.D. 1600). He suffered at Tyburn * (Dec. 1610).

William Scott, another Benedictine, rejecting the same offer two years later, died with equal resolution. These two monks were among the first to join the Spanish congregation at Valladolid.

* Chall. Mem.

Whilst many were thus suffering for the faith, the apostasy of one in high dignity gave great affliction to the Catholics. This unhappy man was Anthony de Dominis, the archbishop of Spalatro, in the states of Venice.

The accession of so great a dignitary to the Protestant cause was rare indeed. He was received with open arms, being "feasted," says Fuller, "whereso-ever he came; and the universities, when he visited them, addressed themselves to him in their solemn reception, as if he himself alone had been an university." He was installed in the wealthy posts of dean of Windsor and master of the Savoy, besides "a good parsonage at West Plesley, in Berkshire" (A.D. 1616). He was not only made to preach publicly before some of the lords of the council, but was encouraged to begin against the Catholic Church, a work upon "the Commonwealth of the Church." It was to be completed in ten books. When four had been written and published, the writer astonished his Protestant friends, not only by refusing to complete the work, but by a public avowal of his grief and horror for his apostasy. "Whether all he had done," says Sir Richard Baker, "was but dissembling from the beginning, or, whether out of remorse of conscience, he repented him of that he had done; after five years' staying here, he retracted all he had said or written before; which so incensed King James, that he commanded him (within three days at his peril) to depart the realm; who, thereupon, went to Rome, and there inveighed as bitterly against the Protestants as he had done in England against the Papists." "Conscience in show, and covetousness in deed," says Fuller, "caused his coming hither." *

* Baker's Jas. I. p. 520; Fuller's Church Hist. b. x. cent. xvii. No. 1.

CHAPTER XXI.

PETITIONS FOR A BISHOP—APPOINTMENT OF DR. KELLISON TO THE PRESIDENTSHIP OF DOUAY COLLEGE—DR. BISHOP'S CONSECRATION —HIS REPLY WHEN ADVISED TO LEAVE THE COUNTRY—THE CLOSE OF THE "SPANISH MATCH"—DR. BISHOP'S CHAPTER—HIS DEATH — FATAL ACCIDENT AT THE FRENCH AMBASSADOR'S — CHARACTER OF JAMES'S REIGN—ACCESSION OF CHARLES—HIS MARRIAGE, AND HIS PLEDGE TO BEFRIEND THE CATHOLICS— DR. SMITH, THE NEW BISHOP—RENEWAL OF PERSECUTION— URBAN THE EIGHTH'S SYMPATHIZING LETTER — DR. SMITH'S SCRUPLES REGARDING THE JURISDICTION AND APPROBATION OF REGULARS—WITHDRAWS FROM ENGLAND—THE CHAPTER— ANOTHER EPISTLE FROM URBAN VIII.

THE secular priests in England and Scotland were governed by archpriests for five-and-twenty years. During the greater part of this period, they had repeatedly petitioned for the more usual government of a bishop. A considerable degree of incapacity, too plainly visible in Dr. Worthington's administration of Douay College, made the petitioners still more urgent. It is scarcely credible, that converts should have been confirmed, admitted into the college, passed through a course of theology, and ordained in the space of twelve, six, and sometimes of only three, months. Yet, so it was; and the mission of course suffered.* Men, little accustomed to collegiate discipline, and often possessing little theological knowledge, were more likely to give scandal than to save souls. The petitioners for episcopal government, therefore, directed all their entreaties, for a time, to the removal of this evil and much internal misadministration in the college. This having been gradually accomplished, first, by the appointment of Dr. Kellison, as president, and

* See the extracts from the Douay Diary in Tierney's Dodd, v. p. 6.

then by his being freed from the now excessive interference of some of the Jesuits, the prayer for a bishop was once more borne to the Holy See (Nov. 1613). It was not, however, listened to. In the year after Dr. Kellison's appointment, Birkhead died the death of the just, and Harrison was appointed as the third archpriest; but still the petition was renewed. Gregory XV., who was now Pope, received it favourably; but was deterred, for the moment, by the bitter threats of James. Sir Toby Matthews, the Jesuit, had informed the English government, undoubtedly from some mistake, that bishops were going to be appointed to all the ancient sees. The king's fury subsided on hearing the truth, and the Pope no longer hesitated to grant the petition.*

The person selected was in every way worthy of the choice. It was Dr. William Bishop, who, for many years, had zealously laboured and suffered for the faith. He was a native of Brailes, in Warwickshire. After spending three or four years at Gloucester Hall, Oxford, he left the university, and, renouncing friends and property, became a student at Douay, and afterwards at Rheims and Rome (A.D. 1574). Being ordained priest, he hastened to the English mission, but was immediately captured; and, after an imprisonment of some duration, was banished (A.D. 1583). He took the opportunity to add to his knowledge of theology. He went to Paris, and passing through the usual course of studies, became doctor of the Sorbonne. Returning again to England, he served the mission for several years, and was then a second time imprisoned and banished.

He had now devoted to the cause about forty years, and, during that time, had written powerfully against Perkins and Abbot, when Gregory selected him for the first vicar-apostolic. He was consecrated bishop of Chalcedon (March 15, 1623).

As soon as he again returned to England, he was

* Tierney's Dodd, vol. v. No. 17, &c. in the App.; and part 4, Addit. art. 2, passim.

advised by one of the privy council to leave the country, at least for a time, and to intrust to others, as his vicars, the administration of his office. The reason urged by this person was, the strength of the Puritans in the House of Commons, and their incessant denunciations of the Catholics. The bishop replied that he feared nothing that the parliament could do; neither a third imprisonment, nor anything worse. He was ready for any infliction. He did not come into England with a disposition to run away as soon as he should see the wolf coming; but rather, as a good shepherd, to lay down his life for his sheep.

Just before his consecration, the fury of the penal laws had a little subsided. Unable to obtain money from his own parliament, James was endeavouring to procure a rich dower by securing the hand of the Spanish infanta for his son Charles. The Spaniards demanded, as a preliminary, that the penal laws should not be enforced. To this James consented, provided the Catholics did not publicly exercise their religious worship. The licentious conduct of the duke of Buckingham, however, brought upon him so much odium that he found means to break off the match, notwithstanding the oath, both of James and Charles. Then ensued, in the English parliament, a scene of almost unparalleled meanness. James, Charles, and Buckingham, professed to state to the two houses what had occurred, yet, by reading garbled extracts, by equivocal and sometimes false assertions and statements, they concealed for the moment their concessions in favour of Catholics, and led to such an impression of the insincerity of the Spaniards, that the nation plunged headlong into a dangerous and expensive war.

The more effectually to remove the suspicions of parliament, James had again let loose the penal laws.

In the midst of the usual invasion of domestic life, of midnight visits, searches, and arrests, the venerable bishop of Chalcedon, worn out with age and toil, passed calmly to his reward (April 13, 1624).

Dr. Bishop had always considered himself to be the ordinary of England and Scotland, and knowing that an ordinary was usually aided by the advice of his canons, he had appointed, a few months before his death (Dec. 10), a cathedral dean and chapter, the latter consisting of nineteen canons, and John Colleton, who had recently discharged the office without the name of an archpriest, being appointed as its first dean.

In the instrument for the creation of the new chapter, Dr. Bishop, as became a faithful pastor, inserted a clause saving the reverence and obedience due to the Apostolic See, and declaring his intention to petition it to supply, in this act of creation or re-erection, whatever deficiency there might be in his own powers.* It does not appear, however, that the chapter was ever more than indirectly recognized or confirmed by Rome.

A short time previous to Dr. Bishop's death, a very fatal accident occurred at Blackfriars, in the house of the French ambassador. A large upper room appears to have been used as a chapel, and during a sermon, at which three hundred Catholics were present, one of the principal beams snapped, and the whole congregation was precipitated through one floor after another, until they reached the basement story. Nearly eighty persons lost their lives, and amongst them two Jesuits. Whilst the others were escaping from the ruins, they were pelted with mud and stones by the inhuman mob.†

* "Cui propterea supplicandum duximus, ut quicquid potestati nostræ in hac parte meritò deesse poterit, id Summi Pastoris suffragio ex potestatis suæ plenitudine suppleatur."—(Ap. Dodd's Records, tom. ii. p. 469.) For an ingenious, but by no means conclusive, interpretation of this clause, see Turnbull's notes to Sergeant's "Account," p. 50.

† Chall. Mem.; More, l. x. No. 7; Fuller's Church Hist. of Brit. b. x. cent. xvii. Nos. 29—34. Fuller states that the Catholics met the accident "in a great upper room in Blackfriars, next to the house of the French ambassador." Fuller was probably trusting to his memory; and about thirty years had elapsed after the disaster before he wrote this part of his History. See his advertisement "To the Reader."

The reign of James I. was now drawing to a close. It had been marked by a singular mixture of gloom and frivolity. It had been ushered in by reckless conspiracies; had been marked by the king's fruitless attempts at Dort and Hampton Court to act in synod as a really effective head of the Anglican Establishment; by the revolt against the inclosures of commons; by the growing independence of the commons; and by the crimes of the duke of Somerset, Lord Bacon, and other favourites and ministers of James; by the then fashionable cock-fighting, and other similar pastimes, as well as by the drunken revels, in which even the ladies of the court were not ashamed to become a spectacle to the whole nation. All was now over. After having outlived most of his earlier favourites and servants, James himself had gone to his account. His funeral was, as usual, speedily followed by a very different spectacle: by all the pomp and festivities that accompany the accession, marriage, and coronation of a new sovereign. Too fair a dawn is often the herald of a stormy day.*

As the young queen, Henrietta of France, was a Catholic, and as in the marriage treaty, made a little before his father's death, Charles had promised, "on the word of a king," that the Catholics, as long as they used the royal indulgence with moderation, and remained good and true subjects, should not be disquieted for their religion, in person or property, the prospects of Catholicity began to brighten, and the Pope thought it a seasonable time for appointing a successor to Dr. Bishop.

The person selected for this important post was Dr. Richard Smith. He was a native of Lincolnshire. After studying at Trinity College, Oxford, he had withdrawn to the continent; and having studied at Rome and Valladolid, entered upon the English mission in 1603. He was well known at the Holy See, not only as a student, but as an agent of the English clergy.

* Contin. of Baker's Chron.

Having despatched the business thus intrusted to him, and laboured upon the mission several additional years, he became the chief of a small number of priests, who had hired the Benedictine house called Arras College, in Paris, and there had formed themselves into a society for writing controversy. Whilst thus occupied, he received information that he was chosen to be Dr. Bishop's successor.

Urban VIII. gave him the same powers in England and Scotland which had been given to the archpriests of England by Clement VIII. and Paul V., as well as those which ordinaries are accustomed to enjoy in their respective dioceses. The cognizance and decision of all causes in the "second instance," and of all appeals, were reserved to the Pope's nuncio in France (Feb. 4, 1625).

The new bishop was soon at his post. If we can believe Fuller, he was not afraid to appear publicly in Lancashire in his pontificals, "with his mitre and crosier, to the wonder of poor people." As, however, the Catholic clergy were mere fugitives in their native land, it is not surprising that Protestant accounts of their movements are generally but flying rumours. Fuller himself, speaking again of Dr. Smith, and having stated that he "was now very busy in his employment," adds: "But when, where, and how oft he acted here is past our discovery, it being never known when men of his profession come hither, till they be caught here." *

* Hardw. State Pap. i. pp. 546 and 547; Sergeant's "Account," p. 51; Fuller's Church Hist. cent. xvii. sect. 1, No. 71, &c., and sect. 2, No. 8. See the Pope's bull in Dodd, vol. iii. fol. In his second volume, p. 466, Dodd has given a supposed brief of Gregory XV., containing a description of the powers to appoint "archdeacons, or even archpriests," confided to Dr. Smith. Dodd himself, however, in his third volume (p. 6), rectifies the mistake: "those powers are not expressed in the brief itself, but supposed to be inferred and gathered from it," &c. This document, purporting to be the brief itself, was found among the Douay MSS. So portentous a mistake may have misled many an unsuspicious reader of the Douay MSS., and may partly explain why some were so warm in Dr. Smith's defence, and so angry with what they thought had been

He divided his extensive diocese into seven vicariates, twenty-three archdeaconries, and a number of rural deaneries.

His exertions, however, were rendered of little avail by a renewal of the persecution. As soon as a large party in the House of Commons, led on by Sir John Elliot, had complained of the open resort of Catholics to the chapels of the ambassadors, and had demanded that the penal laws should be enforced, Charles returned for answer, that their wishes coincided with his own, and with his father's dying injunctions (Aug. 1625). The royal proclamations that followed were the signal for the usual system of searches, arrests, and prosecutions. A great number became willing confessors, and two, at least, suffered a glorious martyrdom. One of these was Richard Herst, a layman, and the other Father Arrowsmith, once a secular priest, and latterly a Jesuit. To comfort the English Church under this new outburst, Urban VIII. wrote a letter to his "beloved children, the Catholics of England."

"Earthly prosperity," he reminded them, "is not always the blessing of Heaven or the patrimony of piety. For, seeing the peace of sinners, the Church has not unfrequently experienced that the power of mortals is the wages of crime. We, therefore, prefer the chains of martyrs to the crowns of victors, and the Everlasting King promises a heavenly principality, not to those who trample down rights with disdainful foot, but to those that suffer persecution for justice sake."

done at Rome. The very ground upon which Barlow, the president of the English Benedictines, had promised obedience to Dr. Bishop in 1623, as well as to withstand all who should resist his authority, was because "it hath pleased Almighty God to make choice of your lordship's person to be the ordinary bishop of our nation."—(Dodd, ii. p. 467, fol.) To rectify the mistakes which had arisen, the college of cardinals issued an instrument, declaring that "the Holy See never intended to make the bishop of Chalcedon the ordinary of England and Scotland," but only to hold the place of an ordinary.—See the instrument in Dodd, iii. p. 18.

Whilst thus encouraging them, whilst reminding them of the prayers of the whole Church for their perseverance to the end, he again impressed upon them the necessity of rejecting the oath of allegiance. If an angel from heaven were to teach you anything different from the apostolic truth, let him be anathema. In order, however, that your virtue may be found more precious than gold which is tried by the fire, show to the whole kingdom that not all the virulence of your enemies can extinguish your charity. Pray for those that persecute you. Let humility, patience, concord, fasting, and prayer, be your weapons. As blessed Peter was forbidden to use the sword against the persecutors of Christ, so do you cherish thoughts of peace; and when the king deprives you of your mortal life, pray that he may receive that which is eternal. Such is the manner of warfare for the soldiers of Christ, under the banner of the cross* (May 30, 1626).

The Pope little thought how requisite indeed was his advice for a more than usual amount of charity. Questions and controversies were at the very time unexpectedly arising and multiplying.

The new bishop seems to have been weighing in his mind the question of the continuance or cessation of old faculties or jurisdiction, upon the appointment of a new bishop, and to have formed the conclusion that, in regard to regulars, such jurisdiction had either ceased upon his appointment, or had become very doubtful. His most prudent course, if such were his real opinion, would have been to consult the Holy See. Unfortunately this was omitted; and still more unfortunately, his opinion was not frankly communicated, but seems to have oozed out in various incidental conversations.

* Ap. More, lib. x. No. 8; Tierney's Dodd, vol. v. p. 161, &c. (notes and App.); Chall. Mem. Miss. Pr. ii. p. 66, &c.; Fuller's Church Hist. cent. xvii. sect. 1, No. 71, &c., and sect. 2, No. 8, &c. Fuller was a contemporary, a writer often flippant and gossiping, and full of antitheses and conceits (see *antea*, p. 59, note).

The doubt itself was probably not well grounded. It has, indeed, been maintained by some theologians, that on the death of a bishop, all jurisdiction emanating from him at once ceases; but the contrary opinion, that jurisdiction (unless of an expressly limited kind) continues until recalled by the deceased prelate's successor, is far more generally held, and is in practice the ordinary rule.*

Dr. Smith, however, seems to have held the former opinion, and, moreover, to have made the renewal of jurisdiction depend upon a new approbation. He was well aware that it was required by the Council of Trent, that all priests, whether secular or religious, ought to receive the bishop's approbation before they heard confessions; but he seems to have overlooked the fact that, previously to Dr. Bishop's appointment, this approbation was given to all the missionary priests in England, through the direct agents of the Holy See.

Once upon the mission, a secular priest was at that time considered liable to no further examination, or any other approbation than the renewal of his faculties, if given for only a limited period. Those missioners who were not seculars being equally approved when first sent upon the mission, and going through precisely the same labours as seculars, it would seem needless and invidious to draw a line of distinction between them, and to require the latter only to obtain a renewal of an approbation already given and richly merited. It was not only invidious, but it was not warranted by either law or practice, except when their faculties had expired. If, however, theirs had indeed expired, equally so must those of the seculars,—both having been granted in the same manner.

It was, therefore, an oversight greatly to be deplored, that Dr. Smith should have adopted the less probable of the two opinions, should not have consulted Rome upon it, and should have taken so

* St. Alphonsus, Theol. Mor. l. vi. tr. 4, No. 559; and Ferrar.

indirect a means of communicating it. Those that deemed it unseasonable to appoint a bishop, would now have a plausible ground of complaint.

The bishop, unhappily, seems to have allowed his very learning to have still further perplexed him. He knew that it was the usual rule of the Church, that the administration of what are sometimes called parochial sacraments, that is, Baptism, Matrimony, Viaticum and Communion to the Sick, and Extreme Unction, belong to the parish priest only; but overlooking the state of persecution, and the fact that none of the missionaries, not even the secular clergy, were parish priests, he began to assert that secular priests only, and not the religious unless approved by him, ought to administer such parochial sacraments.*

It was not, indeed, the place of Catholics to judge their superiors; but where so sudden and important a change was made, not by Rome, and contrary to the arrangements which Rome itself had previously made, it might justly be suspected that there was some grievous want either of knowledge or of judgment. In such a case an appeal, and meantime respectful submission, is the only secure course. This, unfortunately, was not done as soon as the supposed grievance arose: there was discussion, and from domestic discussion animadversion, and written controversy.

When once in print, it could not long remain unnoticed by the public: the Protestant bishops quickly learned that a Catholic prelate was in England, and as quickly petitioned that the laws should be enforced. At the close of 1628, therefore, Charles issued a proclamation for Dr. Smith's arrest. This proclamation being in a few months repeated, with a reward of a hundred pounds to the bishop's captor,

* More, x. No. 9; F. Leander to Card. Barberino, in Claren. Pap. i. p. 212; Dr. Smith's approbations, &c. in Dodd, tom. iii. fol. p. 138, art. 3, in Records of Charles I. In this approbation, Dr. Smith styles himself "Ordinary of England and Scotland." This title he still used in A.D. 1645, notwithstanding an admonition of the whole college of cardinals.—Dodd's Records.

the latter withdrew to France. Although he survived until 1655, he never again returned to England.

Having, like his predecessor, and, it must be added, even after the admonition from the college of cardinals (A.D. 1627), styled himself the ordinary of England and Scotland, he continued the chapter which his predecessor had founded. He afterwards even added to its powers the unusual privilege, that if, after his death, the see should long remain vacant (that is to say, if no other bishop were to be appointed for the English), then the chapter should, without further ratification, elect not only its own canons, provided their number did not exceed thirty, but even the dean himself, whose appointment usually requires at least the co-operation of the bishop (Jan. 8, 1645). The chapter thus constituted was to last, so the instrument stated, until several Catholic bishops, with their respective chapters, had been appointed.*

The manner of the chapter's creation, its want of the formal confirmation of Rome, and the manner in which it was thus to continue, afforded but too ample an opportunity for further discussion. That a bishop, during his own life, may, abstractedly speaking, collect around him a body of advisers, is self-evident; but that such advisers may, without having been confirmed by the Holy See, continue, after the bishop's death, to exercise any special jurisdiction, is by no means evident. In short, here begins the debatable part of the subject. At the present day, however, such an inquiry has lost much of its practical interest; since the Holy See, when reconstructing the hierarchy in 1850, recalled every kind of previous jurisdiction. The details, therefore, of the questions regarding the chapter, which so much engaged the attention of Catholics in the seventeenth century, may now be consigned (at least, in a history such as this) to a

* See Dodd, tom. iii. pp. 78, 140, &c. fol. Dodd himself not being as yet a contemporary, I quote him only so far as his Records support his statements. Sergeant's "Account," pp. 62 and 65; Fuller's Church Hist. of Brit.

respectful oblivion. It is sufficient to know that, for thirty years after Dr. Smith's decease, the chapter appears to have remained in the exercise of some portion, at least, of the jurisdiction thus conferred. It was not until the appointment of the four vicars-apostolic, in the time of James II., that the Holy See interposed its authority. The moment that Dr. Leyburn, the first vicar-apostolic, announced from Rome that he was to act independently of the chapter, the latter submitted; and although its members continued to meet and to administer certain funds, it fell into a sort of abeyance, by ceasing to exercise any kind of authority or jurisdiction.*

Whilst the discussions regarding the various but often commingling questions of episcopal approbation, renewal of faculties, and the powers of the chapter, were as yet in their commencement, Urban VIII. wrote to the English Catholics the following sweet, yet soul-stirring, expostulation :—

"Britannia, not less girt in with the assistance of Heaven than with the waves of the sea" (such were the words of Urban), "once afforded a cheering spectacle to the eyes of the pontifical watchfulness. For in that most noble kingdom, the cross of Calvary triumphed more completely than the sword of the Capitol. Great joy, indeed, to the Church was a nation, queen of the ocean, which, separated in that island as in a citadel of liberty, from the other service of the conquered world, cared little for the lightnings of the Cæsars, but reverenced the thunders of the apostles. The beauty of Libanus and the glory of Carmel bloomed in the wilds of Britain. How changed is

* Dodd, iii. p. 18 (which should be 14), &c.; Sergeant's Account of the chapter, prefixed Address and p. 104, &c. (Turnbull's ed. 1853). Sergeant was born A.D. 1621. When secretary of Morton, bishop of Durham, he became acquainted with the writings of the apostolic fathers, and soon discovered and renounced the errors of Anglicanism. Having studied at Lisbon, he entered upon the English mission in 1652. He became a canon and the secretary of the English chapter. In his "Account" he appears not as an historian of the chapter, but as an advocate.

everything now: the fruitful place is become a salt land. Yet has the Lord, when expelled from its cities, reigned in your hearts, and enabled you to withstand threats and torments. O glory of the Church! O trophy of religion! Not the sword, not persecution, not affliction, have been able to separate you from the love of Christ, and obedience to the Pope. Men have been amazed at your fortitude. The God of armies has borne up your tortured heads, has descended with you into the pit of terror, and has not abandoned his soldiers when bound and purpled with their own blood.

"The evil one, seeing you invincible in sufferings, has devised a different method: he has sown divisions among you. Many he induced to form a party against the archpriest. Now that a bishop is appointed, new dissensions arise. Let all cease, and be extinguished. Of all such matters, and of the interpretations of our letters, the cognizance and decision belongs to the apostolic authority.

"To remove all doubts, we declare that the confessions hitherto heard by priests who are religious are valid, and will continue valid. Having the apostolic authority, they needed not, nor ever will, the authority of the ordinary. Let each missionary enjoy the faculties and privileges which he had in the times of Gregory XIII. and Paul V. If further explanation be required, let it be sought from us and the Apostolic See" (May 9, 1631).*

* Ap. More, x. No. 9, and translated in Dodd, iii. p. 158.

CHAPTER XXII.

PANZANI'S MISSION—BRETT'S OBJECT AT ROME—THE CONVENTIONS —FATHER BLOUNT'S OBJECTIONS—PANZANI'S DEPARTURE—THE NUMBER OF THE CLERGY—THEIR GENERAL CHARACTER, AS PORTRAYED BY ONE OF THE ENGLISH BENEDICTINES.

URBAN'S expostulation, no doubt, allayed the tone of discussion, and changed its subject; but discussion itself still continued. Its object at this time was a new oath of allegiance. A book by a Catholic gentleman, written it is said with the king's own "approbation," revived the half-dormant question of James's oath of allegiance. Charles was willing, according to this book, to require nothing more by the oath than "a true, civil, and natural obedience and fidelity." It is some confirmation of this assertion that, whilst the old oath of allegiance was still exacted, a new one, far less objectionable than the existing one, and also another form of oath drawn up by Father Leander, a Benedictine, were found among the papers of Windebank, one of the king's principal secretaries.

It was, on the other hand, urged in reply by another Catholic gentleman, whose unpublished manuscript was well known by means of numerous copies, that the king's intentions could be of no service without the sanction of parliament. This the writer had the boldness to assert, at the very time when Charles had avowed his determination to rule without a parliament. The truth of the assertion was fully proved by subsequent events.*

Some who had forgotten the constitutional liberty of their forefathers, were greatly shocked at such a

* See Clarend. Pap. vol. i. pp. 83, 129, 169, and 210. The two works, for and against the oath, were considered the works of two noblemen.

declaration. They looked to royal smiles for protection from the outcries of the Puritans, forgetting the frail tenure of everything that depends merely upon the breath of kings; and forgetting, too, that every blow which had hitherto fallen upon them from the days of Henry VIII., was from the hand of royalty. They asked their fellow Catholics to stake everything upon the royal promise, as if Charles had never yet forfeited his word; as if men were to ignore the broken Spanish match, and Charles's equal contempt of his engagement with France.

Anxious as the Holy See was to know thoroughly the condition of its little trembling flock in England, and thus the more easily to restore internal peace, Urban resolved to take advantage of Charles's marriage with a Catholic princess, and to despatch for this purpose some trusty messenger to Henrietta's court. Going in a private capacity, he would escape observation; and, once there, would enjoy every facility for executing his mission. A priest named Panzani, accustomed to ecclesiastical business, was then at Rome. He had once been an Oratorian, but was obliged by continued sickness to leave that community. This was the person who was intrusted with the execution of Urban's wishes.

He arrived in England, it appears, at the close of 1634. The king was not ignorant that Panzani had some business with the clergy, but he seems to have merely observed that he should be cautious, and not meddle with state affairs. These words, if such were used, were almost the very terms of the Pope's instructions to the envoy. The latter corresponded, at least occasionally, with Secretary Windebank, who was evidently the recognized channel of communication between Panzani and the king.* During Panzani's residence in England, Captain Brett was despatched by Charles to Rome. Nominally, the captain went in

* See Records of Panzani in Dodd, iii. p. 128, &c. fol.; and Dodd's account of Panz. ib. p. 40; Instruct. to Brett, in Clarend. Pap. i. p. 354.

the queen's service, but, in reality, his chief business was to obtain the Pope's approbation of the oath of allegiance. He, of course, failed.

When Panzani had spent nearly a year in England, a circumstance occurred which shows how slight a cause could give birth to a lengthened misunderstanding. A convention was drawn up professing to be on the part of the secular clergy on the one hand, and of the religious on the other. In this, both agreed to act unanimously, for the common good of religion in England, and to render all mutual assistance; and, as far as they had the power, not to suffer the Pope to be misled by false statements, nor the honour of the king or queen, or of the state, to be injured. For this purpose they determined to hold a meeting every three months, or oftener if necessary. As a sanction to their proceedings, they were to procure, if possible, the presence of Panzani at the meeting (A.D. 1635). If the other orders wished to enter into the same covenant of peace, they would be admitted with pleasure. This bond was subscribed by three of the secular clergy, three Benedictines, two Dominicans, and two Franciscans.

There was, however, another to which subscriptions were not attached. It was on the part of the religious a promise not to oppose the establishment of episcopal rule, nor to hinder the bishop or bishops, when appointed, from enjoying the full rights and privileges conceded by the Holy See. On the part of the secular clergy, it was a promise not to hinder the religious from enjoying their rights received from the Holy See, under their respective superiors. Both parties agreed that, as soon as the secular clergy should have a superior resident in England, they would treat of the more special conditions of peace and concord.*

Excellent, indeed, were the objects proposed by

* See the treaties, &c, in More, x. No. 15, &c., and Dodd, who gives no subscriptions, but only the names of those who made the second or verbal agreement.

these documents. Yet they wear, on the first glance, an appearance of novelty, not altogether pleasing in matters of ecclesiastical discipline. The Holy See had spoken; it had commanded peace: what need then of any bond, but that of simple obedience? What need, moreover, of promising to respect the rights conceded to each by the Holy See? Were they not already bound in conscience to respect them?

Then, again, there was something not altogether savouring of harmony, in the fact that the Jesuits had received no invitation to participate in the bond, nor any intimation that any such plan was contemplated. They formed no inconsiderable part of the entire English clergy, being at this time nearly two hundred in number, and having in consequence been recently erected into a province (Jan. 1623). Their first provincial, Father Blount, sometimes called Blond, thought that the omission reflected upon his order. He, therefore, in a most temperate instrument, expressed his own earnest desire for peace; but solemnly declared his utter ignorance of the convention, until it had actually taken place (Nov. 25, 1635).

Having, at the same time, written to Panzani, he received, for the first time, a copy of that agreement which had been verbally assented to, but not subscribed.

With great reason did he, in reply, express his surprise at such a document. He would, he said, most willingly do anything for general peace and harmony; but what other secure way to this could there be, but to obey the brief of Urban VIII.? That brief commanded that all contests should be suppressed, and be conducted nowhere, under pain of excommunication, except at the Apostolic See. To consult the Pope, then, to await patiently, and to obey his decision, is the plan best calculated for peace, and most consistent with our duty.* Surely then it is unnecessary to enter into a bond. "None of us have

* More, x. Nos. 17 and 18, and 3; and l. ix. No. 34; Dodd, iii. p. 134, &c.

ever opposed the establishing of a bishop." The faculties of both seculars and regulars emanate from the Holy See, and must be equally respected by all. In short, we need not lay down terms of peace: the Holy See will point out to us our respective duties, according to every new exigency.

So weighty did Father Blount's remonstrances appear to the learned Father Preston, one of the Benedictines who had attached his name, that he now raised his voice against the agreement.

It is unnecessary to dwell at greater length upon these differences. It is enough to know something of their nature, in order that no one may be downcast when he finds that his own age is not without them. What age, indeed, in the history of man, when truly known, has been found without them?

Panzani appears to have scarcely equalled the expectations of the Holy See. Seeing in Cottington and Windebank, two of the ministers of state,* an apparent leaning to Catholicity, he became more communicative than was desirable. The manner in which he spoke to them upon the oath, as if it might be "softened" down, incurred a direct rebuke from his patron, Cardinal Barberini, the Pope's chief minister. Various other expressions and designs were equally disliked, and his mission soon terminated. †

At this period, when the long storm of persecution, violent as it still continued, was more than half spent, it is not a little interesting to be able to ascertain the number of the surviving clergy. Scanty as their ranks may appear, compared to their brethren a century before, yet was it little less numerous than it actually is at the present day.

Father Leander, made superior of the English Benedictines in 1634, amongst other information sent to Rome, made the following report of the numbers of

* They both eventually became Catholics.—See Dodd, iii. (Lives of Noblem.) pp. 47 and 59.

† Records of Panz. No. xiv. to the end, Dodd, tom. iii. p. 136; Clarend. Pap. (Selby to Fath. Leand.) vol. i. p. 336.

all the missionaries in England:* "In England, five hundred or more of the secular clergy; about two hundred and fifty Jesuits; a hundred Benedictines, more or less; twenty Dominicans; as many Carmelites; more than thirty Franciscans; four Scotch and English Capuchins, and as many Minims." This gives a sum total of nearly a thousand missionaries.

Of the regulars (to say nothing of the Jesuits), the Dominicans, Carmelites, and Franciscans had their own provincials in England. The Franciscans had a convent in Belgium for the education of English youth.

The Benedictines had, a few years before, coalesced with their Spanish brethren in the United Spanish and English Congregation; and still more recently, had been formed into an unmixed English Congregation. Their superior was termed the Apostolic prefect. Out of England, there were under the prefect, five definitors, who aided him in ruling the mission, and also four conventual priors, and one abbess. In England there were two provincials with their four definitors, and under each provincial four "præpositi." Their convent and college at Douay was founded and endowed by Philip de Cavarel, the abbot of St.

* Father Leander was very sanguine in his hopes of an immediate reunion of England with the Holy See. This reunion he strove most zealously to promote. With all respect, however, to his excellent motives, his judgment, in several instances, may fairly be suspected. Connected with this deficiency, if not another instance of it, is his view of the royal power. The king's dispositions and wishes were, in his eyes, nearly everything. The good father saw not the multitude of men who were not Puritans, and who yet were indignant at Charles's despotism. Charles might have become a Catholic; but this would have made Catholicity doubly odious. The king's despotism would have been attributed to his Catholicity. Another apparent oversight was Father Leander's constant argument, that such and such a thing pleased or displeased the king. There is too much reason to think, that if a reunion could have been effected with such views, the yoke of the Edwards would have again been set upon the neck of the Church.—See lett. &c. in the Clar. Papers, pp. 205, 207, 243, 271, and passim. Father Leander, on his death-bed, retracted, it was reported, what he had urged regarding the oath.—Clar. Pap. i. p. 711.

Vedast, in Arras, at the suggestion of Father Leander, alias John Skidmore, who styles himself the abbot's instrument in the good work.

The Jesuits, the most numerous by far of all the regulars in England, had three colleges in Belgium for the education of the English. In England itself, despite of the persecution, they had certain houses for meeting and practising their spiritual exercises, as well as to serve as schools for the children of the upper classes.

The secular priests were about twice as numerous as the Jesuits. They were now, by the arrangements of Dr. Bishop and Dr. Smith, governed (to say nothing of the chapter) by six vicars-general, eighteen archdeacons, and a number of rural deans.

Father Leander, still writing to Rome, speaks in the highest terms of the whole body, almost without exception, of these devoted missionaries: scarcely any other part of Christendom could produce an equal number of priests so illustrious for learning and holiness of life.*

Some exceptions, of course, there were; arising chiefly from the ordinary studies of some being cut short before the students themselves had been sufficiently tried, or sufficiently grounded in requisite knowledge, or provided with a fixed abode and decent maintenance.

* Ap. Clar. Pap. vol. i. pp. 180, 199, 200, and 221. The number of deaneries, &c., may have been altered since their first erection.

CHAPTER XXIII.

CHARACTER OF CHARLES I.—STATE OF PARTIES—THE CONTRADICTORY ELEMENTS IN ANGLICANISM—THE KING'S SUPPOSED CATHOLIC TENDENCIES—THE LONG PARLIAMENT AND THE KING'S ADVISERS—GOODMAN'S REPRIEVE AND GENEROSITY—OTHER CONTESTS AND NUMEROUS MARTYRS—ANGLICANISM SUPPLANTED—RIGOROUS PERSECUTION OF THE CATHOLICS—A GLIMPSE INTO THE INNER LIFE: THE QUESTION OF THE STATE OF PERFECTION—THE DECISION OF ALEXANDER VII.

Whenever Charles signed the death-warrants of priests, it was not from cruelty, but from the weakness with which he first resisted and then granted the demands of the Commons. The free spirit of Englishmen, beaten down by Henry VIII. and Elizabeth, was now no longer to be controlled: it claimed the rights which had been enjoyed before the Reformation. Had Charles known the old English constitution, and the real principles of law and justice, and had he yielded all that which such a knowledge would have suggested, he would still have had to grapple with much in the Puritan party that was anti-monarchical. A moderate amount of firmness and sincerity would, it can scarcely be doubted, have ultimately prevailed; for the Catholic spirit of loyalty was still vigorous. Unfortunately, Charles was ignorant of what he governed, and certainly acted as if ignorant of some of the chief principles of right. Nor was he frank enough to avow his errors, nor firm enough to maintain his principles. The more his character was known, the more was he contemned. The Puritans, therefore, triumphed: they appeared, for a time, as the champions of liberty. They won in the Long Parliament (what was indeed a boon to Catholics no less than to dissenters), the suppression

of the powers of the court ecclesiastical, or High Commission; so that the said court should no longer have the power to exact oaths, levy fines, or inflict bodily punishments of any kind. They sought and won on the field, what was demanded in vain in parliament. It was not until the more fanatical of their body, the Independents and Baptists, had deposed and slain the king, and impoverished the people, and erected a military despotism, that the nation saw them in their true character, and shook them off, and sought refuge again in a monarchy.*

Under such a king, the Catholics were in comparative peace,† unless it happened that parliament was sitting. As soon, however, as the Commons met, their first cry was for the blood of Catholics, and Charles, struggling to obtain supplies, feared to enter upon a new contest, and therefore, too often weakly and unjustly yielded to the clamour.

What made him more inclined to shrink from a contest on this subject, was the charge against his favourites, and even, in some degree, against himself, of a plan for a reconciliation with the Catholic Church.‡

The nature of the most vague of all tests, the Thirty-nine Articles (drawn up in 1562), has admitted into the Church by law established two especially conflicting codes, both of discipline and belief, the Arminian and the Calvinistic, corresponding, more or less, with the present High and Low Church. The

* See stat. 16 Car. I., Clarend., Dodd, and Echard, passim.

† The very proclamations issued against them told of a great change. Thus, one of 1633 (see Clar. Pap. i. p. 71) forbade them, indeed, to make converts; but with regard to Mass, merely forbade them to go publicly.—See App. EE.

‡ "The powerful faction of the Puritans is offended with the moderate lenity of the king and his counsellors, and suspects that all things tend to a union with the Apostolic See."—(Father Leander to Cardinal Bentivoglio, July, 1634, Clar. Papers, vol. i. p. 129.) Something unusual there certainly was. Laud sought to know what the German Catholics thought of the Church of England.—(Howard to Windebank, Clar. Papers, i. p. 617.) Laud, too, was in communication, through one of his chaplains, with Father Preston, the Benedictine.—(Clar. Papers, i. 303.)

former tolerates the theoretical belief of almost any Catholic dogma, except that of the Pope's supremacy. To this party Charles lent all his influence. He thus incurred the resentment of the more active of the opposite party. They whispered, loudly, that he was favouring the Catholics. They pointed to the conversions of several persons of rank which had come to their knowledge, as a confirmation of their charge.* The Puritans, both those that concealed themselves within the Establishment by outward conformity, and those that braved its displeasure, united with this party, and raised a storm which Charles dared not encounter. In the beginning of his reign, Montague, who became bishop of Chichester, was charged with saying that the Church of Rome was the true Church, and narrowly escaped the wrath of the Commons. Three years later, the king himself was assailed as an enslaver of the conscience, for having favoured Arminianism, and for having inserted in the Articles the clause: "The Church of England hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, and hath authority in matters of faith."

* Among the converts in the first half of the seventeenth century were Goodman, bishop of Gloucester; Walter Montague, a son of the earl of Manchester; John Serjeant, the secretary of the bishop of Durham, well known for his controversial writings; Sir George Calvert, afterwards Lord Baltimore, the proprietor and colonizer of Maryland. Sir Toby Matthews, a skilful diplomatist, high in the esteem of James I., and afterwards the friend of the unhappy Strafford during his lieutenancy in Ireland, had become a Catholic, and eventually a Jesuit and priest, without disclosing the change, quitting the court, or compromising his principles.—(See Oliver's Biog. and Dodd, iii. pp. 59 and 155, &c.) Sir William Davenant, the poet laureate, did not become a Catholic until the close of the first civil war.—(Dodd, iii. 250.) Woodhead, one of the proctors of the university of Oxford, having, it seems, during a stay at Rome, become a Catholic, employed himself in writing controversial and historical works. For solid reasoning and learning he earned the encomiums even of Protestants. —(Dodd, iii. p. 266, fol.) Cressy, a canon of Windsor, and chaplain to the famous Lord Falkland, was received into the Church, at Rome, A.D. 1646. He became a Benedictine, and wrote many useful works; the one most generally known being his "Church History of Brittany:" the part published terminates with the Norman Conquest.—(Ib. p. 308.)

The opposition thus evoked was, however, a mere shadow of the outbreak which fell upon the bewildered king in the Long Parliament. Laud, the archbishop of Canterbury, was imprisoned on a charge of high treason; while Strafford, another of Charles's advisers, was impeached and executed (A.D. 1641). When thus powerless with fear, consenting to the death of his own friends, and even against his own promise, there was little hope, indeed, that he would befriend the Catholics.

Even the mother of Queen Henrietta could not escape the insults of the mob; and was compelled to abandon the kingdom (A.D. 1641). Her daughter could scarcely be screened from a similar fate, being assailed as the head and centre of the Catholic body, and the cause of the supposed movement towards the Catholic Church.*

It was against the Catholic clergy, however, that the spleen of the triumphant Puritans was chiefly directed. The eagerness with which both houses pursued the life of one priest, although it did not, as usual, terminate in blood, will give some insight into the bitter feelings of the age. The priest referred to was named Goodman. He was educated at Oxford, and became a Protestant minister. Being converted, and made a priest after the usual studies at Douay, he finally entered upon the English mission. He was captured in 1635, but released on bail. This moderate treatment drew upon him a written attack from Prynne, the celebrated Puritan. After another capture and release, Goodman was finally taken, tried, and condemned (A.D. 1640).

Charles, on the ground that he was convicted, not of "perverting" any, but of being "a priest merely," was desirous of commuting this sentence either into banishment or imprisonment, at the discretion of the Peers. This, however, was too merciful for parliament, which was now swayed by a strong and determined

* Dean Colleton's letter against the queen's traducers, Dodd's Rec. iii. p. 146.

band of Puritans. They stormed at this proof of the king's popish tendencies; and thought it not beneath the dignity of the two houses to stop the business of one of our most memorable epochs in order to hold a conference and to make a remonstrance against Charles's lenity, reminding him of the statutes of Elizabeth and James, and insisting that the law should have its course.

Hearing of this contention, Goodman petitioned the king,—"rather to remit your petitioner to their mercy, than to let him live the subject of so great discontent in your people against your majesty: for it hath pleased God to give me the grace to desire with the prophet, that if this storm be raised for my sake, I may be cast into the sea, that others may avoid the tempest."

This magnanimity put an end to the dispute. The parliament was struck dumb; and Goodman remained unmolested, dying in Newgate in 1645.*

In 1641, Charles signed the death-warrants of Ward and Barlow, the former a secular priest, and the latter a Benedictine. They suffered with the usual cheerfulness and fortitude.

At the close of the same year, seven priests were condemned at once at the Old Bailey. The king, at the solicitation of the French ambassador, consulted the parliament. The latter put the fate of the condemned one by one to the vote, and awarded death to all. As the king nevertheless granted a reprieve, another contest arose. The king at last replied, that if they considered their execution necessary for the work of the reformation, they were to pass a resolution to that effect, and certify it to his ministers, and the law would then have its course.

The parliament well knew that its strength lay in its popularity, and it dared not appear so eager for blood as by its own vote to be the evident cause of

* Nalson's Impartial Collection of Great Affairs of State, vol. i. pp. 738 and 746; and Chall. (ii. p. 81), who quotes Nalson at some length.

death. It said no more upon what it had so long and so urgently pressed the king.

The latter, however, was by no means eager to engage in these conflicts; and accordingly, in 1642, no fewer than eight priests were executed in different parts of England.*

When the various questions between Charles and his parliament had terminated in a sanguinary war, and this again had terminated in the king's arrest and execution, the triumphant remnant of the House of Commons exercised an authority greater than that which it had resisted in Charles, and, in the use of this new, unlimited, and irresponsible authority, it had an ample opportunity of exercising its fanatical hatred of Catholicity. Even the Presbyterians, the more moderate section of the Puritans, no less than the Independents and Anabaptists, poured out upon it all their bitterness. The loyalty of Catholics had now been put to the test, and had proved itself beyond all question: they had sacrificed life and property for a king who had often shed their blood upon the scaffold.† Yet this very loyalty was a new crime in the eyes of the victorious Puritans. Catholics could no longer be reproached with conspiring against the Crown, but they could be branded as "malignants," the term given to all royalists, as well as "papists," and thus on a twofold ground the persecution was fiercely maintained. The new laws, the new oath, and the general suffering, may perhaps be best described by those contemporaries and eye-witnesses, whose narratives have been incorporated in Challoner's Memoirs.

"The first of these ordinances bears date April 1, 1643, appointing certain persons, there named, to be commissioners or sequestrators for the several counties

* Chall. ii. pp. 82, 91, 98, &c.

† See Lord Castlemain's list of Catholics of rank who died in battle for the king during the civil war, as well as of those who forfeited their estates in the same cause.—Ap. Chall. Mem. part ii. p. 176.

of England and Wales, and empowering them forthwith to seize as well all the monies and other personal estate, as also all the manors, lands, and other real estates of notorious delinquents, that is to say, of all persons who had then raised, or should afterwards raise, arms against the parliament, or who had voluntarily contributed, or should contribute, any monies, horse, plate, arms, ammunition, or other aid or assistance, towards the maintenance of any forces raised against the parliament. And also two parts of all the estates of every papist, or which any person had in trust, or for the use of any papist; this to be let, set, sold, and converted, and applied to the uses of the parliament, towards supporting the charges of the war.

"A second ordinance passed the nineteenth day of August in the same year, containing an explanation and further enlargement of the fore-mentioned ordinance for sequestering the estates of delinquents and papists. In this is explained who are to be deemed papists, and who are liable to the penalty mentioned above; that is, of having two parts of their estate seized for the use of the parliament. These are, first, all such as have willingly harboured any popish priest since the 29th of November, 1642, or that should hereafter harbour any; secondly, all that had been already convicted of popish recusancy; thirdly, or that have been at Mass any time within one whole year before the 26th of March, 1643, or should hereafter be at Mass, or whose children or grandchildren, or any of them living in the house with them, or under their tuition, shall be brought up in the popish religion; finally, all such persons as, being of the age of twenty-one years, should refuse to take the oath of abjuration, 'by which they abjure and renounce transubstantiation,' &c., which oath any two of the committee-men or any two justices of the peace, or, for want of these, the mayor, bailiffs, or head officer of any city or town corporate, had power to tender to any suspected papist. All these are here declared liable

to the penalty above mentioned; that is, two parts of three of their whole estates, real and personal, were to be forthwith seized, sold, and disposed, for the uses of the parliament.

"And to the end that a full discovery might be had of the Catholic estates, so that it should be morally impossible for them to convey away any part of their effects, or conceal or screen them from the commissioners' knowledge, by the assistance of their Protestant friends or otherwise, the said sequestrators were further empowered, by this second ordinance, to examine upon oath any person suspected to be aiding in concealing these men or their effects, or intrusted for them, or should owe anything, or be indebted to any papist; and if the said persons should refuse to be examined, or to declare the whole truth, they were to be committed to safe custody till they should conform, and make the discovery insisted upon by the commissioners.

"And for the more speedy and effectual seizure of personal estates of the said delinquents and papists, the commissioners had power to authorize their several collectors and agents employed under them, to break open all locks, bolts, bars, doors, or other strength, where monies or goods were, upon probable grounds, suspected to be concealed, and seize the same into their possession: with this further engagement to such as were assisting to the sequestrators, that for their reward they were to have one shilling in the pound of all monies, lands, or goods, as they should discover; and for their indemnity, the protection of both houses of parliament, and to be esteemed as persons who did acceptable service to the commonwealth.

"Finally, amongst the remarkable instructions given to the sequestrators, consisting of thirteen articles, that of number six ought to be carefully remembered, viz.: You are to seize two parts of the estates, both real and personal, of all papists (as they are papists), and the whole estates of other sorts of delinquents

mentioned in the said ordinance, whether they be papists or others; and you are to understand by two parts of papists' estates, two of their whole lands, and two of their goods, into three to be divided.

"Armed with these powers, the sequestrators set out towards their respective divisions, and fell to seize, sell, or let, the estates of papists wherever they could come at them." *

The results of such an expedition at such a time may be easily surmised. The confiscation of the entire property of those who had borne arms for the king was at once summarily completed. The other ordinances were rigorously executed, and even sometimes exceeded. An eye-witness, after mentioning the spoliation of the cavaliers, or those who had fought for the king, thus proceeds:—

"Others are equally punished, that is, their whole estate sequestered, allowing only a fifth part for their wives and children, though, in true reason, they are altogether justifiable; having never been in any engagement, but found only in some garrisons of the king, whither they were driven for refuge, being put out of the protection of the parliament by public proclamation, their houses everywhere rifled, their goods plundered, and lives endangered by the soldiers. . . . Some recusants of this class, who never bore arms, but were only found in garrisons for their own personal security, as aforesaid, are now ranked among the highest delinquents, and their estates to be sold; such as Sir Henry Bedingfeld, Mr. Bodenham, Mr. Gifford, &c."

The writer might here have added the actual loss, not only of property but of life, to which Catholics were sometimes even illegally subjected. An officer, in the earl of Manchester's army, narrated to Mr. Austin the following brief tragedy, of which he was an eye-witness. In 1644 the parliamentary forces took Lincoln. The next day "some of our

* Apud Chall. Mem. part ii. p. 169, &c.

common soldiers, in cold blood, meeting with Mr. Price, of Washingley, in Huntingdonshire, a papist, asked him, 'Art thou Price, the papist?'—'I am,' said he, 'Price, the Roman Catholic;' whereupon one of them immediately shot him dead." *

The Catholics who had not been either in the armies or garrisons of the king, experienced, not indeed the same extent of suffering, but at least the same stern execution of the ordinances. If they refused to attend the Presbyterian service (this having now supplanted the Anglican form of worship), or to take the oath of abjuration, they lost at once two-thirds of their estates: "then come the excisemen, tax-gatherers, and other collectors," with demands not merely for the third, but for the whole of the estate, "and pinch away no small part of the poor third penny that was left them."

Although so cruelly afflicted, although "in continual fear of having their houses broken open and searched by pursuivants," let it not be thought that the Catholics were absorbed by their miseries and terrors: "they bear all, not only with patience, but even silence."

"And, as for priests, it is made as great a crime to have taken orders after the rites of their Church, as to have committed the most heinous crime that can be imagined, and they are far more cruelly punished than those that murder their own parents." During the five years that followed the case of Goodman, nineteen were executed in the usual barbarous manner, besides several who lost their lives through the cruelty of parliamentary soldiers, or other harsh treatment, and not a few who underwent imprisonment, with all its accompaniment of privation and insult.†

As it was with the great body of the laity, so was it with the clergy: they pursued the usual tenor of their life peacefully and energetically, until they were

* Austin's Christian Moderator, ap. Chall. ii. p. 171, &c., and passim. For some details furnished by the same writer, see ib. p. 173.

† Ib. part ii. p. 142, and passim.

hurried away to share the contempt and the crown of either martyrs or confessors.

As soon, moreover, as the first outburst of puritanical violence had, after a few years, exhausted itself, the clergy could even find time and spirit enough, not only for their immediate duties, but for discussing the various questions which, from mistakes or other human infirmities, must continually arise.

One of their subjects of discussion was but indirectly connected with external facts, and yet is often the very root and life of those more striking, but generally very superficial circumstances.

From the earliest ages of the Church, one of the first desires felt in those souls that "hunger and thirst after justice," is to ascertain what is the most perfect state of life. Is it the contemplative, the life of Mary as contrasted with that of Martha, the life afterwards of St. Paul, the first hermit, and of St. Anthony of Egypt? Or is it the active life, that of Martha, busy with much serving, but yet serving our Lord? Or is it a state in which these two are united, the spirit of contemplation, and of union with God exercising itself at times in the external offices of the good Samaritan? St. Thomas of Aquin decides in favour of the last.

This question is not speculative, but eminently practical: fallen, indeed, would that generation be which never sought for its solution. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the most interesting form of this question was that which regarded secular priests. They frequently asked, Are we in the most perfect state? or is there one yet higher, by being more directly conformable to the will of God, and by, therefore, most easily and completely restoring fallen man to the likeness of God?

In answer to this, some appealed to St. Thomas of Aquin, and declared that the life of the religious was preferable. St. Thomas, indeed, applies his principles to the case of a parish priest, and, whilst admitting the sanctity of such a state, yet shows that a priest who is a

religious in a "mixed" order is in a state still more perfect.* This solution, however, did not strictly apply to England. There were no parish priests in the country. Was the same answer to be given in the case, not of a parish priest, but of a missionary apostolic, as all the priests upon the mission were? Here arose no small difficulty. Not a few, however, of the secular priests made up their minds to the affirmative, and joined the Benedictines, or Jesuits, or other bodies of religious.

Those, on the other hand, who had been educated totally or in part upon the funds of the Roman, or other colleges, would here be met with a new question. Could they justly abandon the object for which they had been thus educated? or if that object would certainly be no less attained in a religious order, could they join such an order while bound by the oath to serve upon the mission? Some thought that the religious life being the more perfect, and the call to perfection being made to all that could embrace it, they could not intend in the oath to bind themselves not to follow it. Others, therefore, who had considered all these circumstances, still continued, from time to time, to enter some religious order.

The Holy See, perceiving this, solved the latter part of this intricate and delicate question: Alexander VII. declared that those who thus eluded the oath, by alleging that it impeded their greater good, understood not the importance of the duties of apostolic missionaries. The brief in which he made this declaration is too long for an exact translation. As, however, the question which it handles is of practical consequence, it would appear advisable that it should speak, as far as possible, for itself. The following is its substance, and occasionally its very words:—Since the oath administered to the students of the Pope's colleges, who are educated by the Holy See at a heavy cost, has been variously interpreted, and sometimes in such a manner as to elude the intentions of the Holy See, and thus to

* Summa, Secunda Sec., quæs. 184, 188, and 189 (art. vii.).

detract greatly from the glory and service of God, we, having consulted the cardinals who watch over the Propagation of the Faith, and having maturely considered the whole question, declare by our apostolical authority, that the said students are bound, not for three years only, as some have gratuitously explained it, but for the whole of their life, to the service of the Holy See; and do not at all render this service, even if they, in some way or other, exert themselves for the salvation of souls, unless they render it according to what is marked out by the Holy See. Moreover, if any one is ejected from his college, or leaves it through ill-health, even before completing his studies or receiving holy orders, he is not to be considered freed from the oath, either with regard to serving on the mission or of not entering a religious order. We, therefore, forbid any student, at any time, without the express and written permission of ourselves or our successors, to enter a religious order, under pain of his profession being null *ipso jure*. Moreover, let no student think that he may enter religion, or any other state, for the sake of a more secure subsistence, since the Congregation for the Propagation has never been accustomed to leave any one destitute who had been ordained on the title of the mission. If it has otherwise happened, it has been because the persons themselves neglected to inform the Congregation. As, again, there are some, "who, not understanding the importance of the office of secular priests admitted to apostolic missions, or what (especially considering the circumstances of times and places) greatly promotes the propagation of our holy faith, and the good of the Universal Church, dare, moreover, to assert, that an oath such as this, inasmuch as it closes the entrance into every religious order, is absolutely invalid, because it impedes a greater good," and under this pretext presume to neglect this part of the oath, we command all the students who have left their colleges, whether in orders or not, and whether in a religious order or still seculars, to inform the said Congregation every year of their

place of residence, their condition, their occupations and pursuits, and that the letters containing this information be forwarded to the nearest nuncio of the Holy See. We command the superiors of the missions of secular priests, under pain of suspension *ipso facto* incurred, to make an annual inquiry into the students, whether in religion or not, with regard to their occupations, condition, and place of abode. To cut off any plea of ignorance of these injunctions, we order the superiors of the colleges to cause this letter to be publicly read in their respective refectories, on the first Sundays of January and June, every year, and, also, to be distinctly read to the students before they take the above-mentioned oath, and that the students add to their oath the clause that they interpret its obligation according to the decrees emitted by the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, and confirmed by the present Apostolic brief. And because for want of such labourers, many regions which are white for the harvest are piteously perishing, we command both the superiors of the colleges, under pain of suspension *ipso facto* incurred, to transmit to the Congregation the name, age, country, ability, and studies of every fresh student, as soon as he is admitted to the college, and, also, the students themselves, under pain of ejection, not to defer the oath beyond the age marked in the decree of Urban VIII. (Nov. 24, 1625), as well as the superiors, under pain of suspension, not to permit such a delay, without a grave cause, and the written permission of the Congregation.

Let no one, however high in dignity, presume to put any interpretation upon these injunctions. If he doubts their meaning, let him consult the Holy See. If he act otherwise, he violates the oath. Let this letter be held valid. Whatever may be alleged of persons not being heard, or of anything being surreptitiously obtained, or of our intention, or anything else, let its commands be inviolably observed. Let not even cardinals, or legates *a latere*, or any delegates,

ordinaries, or any other persons whatever, judge or interpret differently. If they do, whether knowingly or ignorantly, let their decision be null and void, whatever be the nature or terms of their authority. Given under the Fisherman's Ring, at St. Mary Major's, in Rome, July 20, 1660.*

* Bullar. Magn.; see also Ben. XIV.'s letter (postea, c. 26, p. 371.)

CHAPTER XXIV.

LOYALTY OF THE CATHOLICS—INGRATITUDE OF CHARLES—THE PETITION AND EXPLANATION OF THE CATHOLICS—CLARENDON'S HOSTILITY AND SUCCESS—THE CORPORATION AND CONVENTICLE ACTS—THE LONDON MONUMENT—DISCOVERY OF CATHOLIC SCHOOLS AND CHAPELS—SHAFTESBURY—THE TEST ACTS—OATES'S PLOT—WALL AND KEMBLE.

During the late civil wars, the Catholics, to a man, had arrayed themselves under the royal banner. Even as early as 1638, at the first indications of the Scottish rebellion, Champney, the dean of the English chapter, wrote a circular to the Catholics, urging them not only to have recourse to fervent prayer, but to be prepared to prove their loyalty to their king in all circumstances, "with their fortunes and persons, according as his majesty shall please to command or accept of their service in that kind." Nobly did the Catholics respond to the appeal. Robert Dormer, the Catholic Earl of Caernarvon, who was slain in the first battle of Newbury, was but one of a numerous band who gave both property and life for their king. Marmaduke Langdale, who routed the Scotch at Corbridge, overthrew the republicans in Lincolnshire, made even Fairfax retreat, and captured Berwick and Carlisle, was another of the same forgiving and heroic stamp. Goring, the defender of Portsmouth and the leader in the second civil war, was a Catholic worthy in every sense of his bold compeers.

Among the more remarkable sieges of private strongholds, that of Wardour Castle, belonging to the Catholic Lord Arundel, holds an honourable place. Basing House, the seat of the Marquis of Worcester, a Catholic, was, of all the royal fortresses, one of the last to surrender, yielding, even then, only to Cromwell himself.

When Charles I. had been beheaded, and Charles II. had entered England, and had suffered a total overthrow at Worcester, his escape from his dogged pursuers was owing to the devotedness of the Huddlestones, the Giffards, the Whitgreaves, the Penderells, and other Catholics of Staffordshire, both gentlemen and peasants. Even to this day the Penderells receive a pension for the devoted loyalty of their rustic ancestors.

When, therefore, Charles was called to his father's throne, the Catholics naturally expected, if not the restoration of the estates which their loyalty had forfeited, certainly an acknowledgment of their services, and the toleration and protection due to faithful subjects. The heart of the world is as hard as its smile is bland: they were disappointed. Charles took no public notice of them for many months. When, at last, he referred to their grievances, he condescended "to avow to the world a due sense we have of the greatest part of our Roman Catholic subjects having deserved well of our royal father, of blessed memory, and from us, and even from the Protestant religion itself, in adhering to us with their lives and fortunes for the maintenance of our crown." Continuing in the same strain, he stated that he wished to put no one to death for religion, and yet, in the very same speech, he warned the Catholics not to have the presumption to hope for a toleration (Dec. 1662). This was enough: petitions poured in against the Catholics; and once more a royal proclamation ordered all Jesuits and other priests to quit the kingdom, under pain of suffering all the penalties of the law. "Put not your trust in princes." *

Before the king had thus declared himself, the

* Dodd, fol. tom. iii. pp. 46 and 240; Clarend. Hist. and Father Huddleston's Relation, passim.

See Champ.'s letter in Dodd, iii. p. 145, fol. The "Apology" of Lord Castlemain for the Catholics, published in the middle of the reign of Charles II. "There was never no Papist that was not deemed a cavalier," says Castlemain.

Catholics had made a strenuous effort to obtain redress; and even now they were by no means so spirit-broken as to acquiesce without an effort. They assembled, formed themselves into a committee, and petitioned the House of Lords, through Lord Arundel of Wardour, that they, as well as others, might receive the benefit of the "declaration from Breda" (June 1661). "That we differ," the petition stated, "from those that profess the religion established in this kingdom, even in matters of religion, is no question." "But the only material question (as we humbly conceive) is this, whether our opinions are consistent with our obedience to the king, and the peace of the kingdom?" They, then, declared that, whilst it was an "article" of their faith to obey their prince, it was no article of their faith that the Pope had "any authority to depose a king, or absolve his subjects from their allegiance:" and they submitted it to the consideration of the House, whether it were likely "that, contrary to an article of our faith, and so sworn to be by us, we should espouse an opinion that is only problematical, to the prejudice of our duties, and contrary to our oath" (June 21, 1661).

The petition was received with some favour. Although Chancellor Hyde, afterwards earl of Clarendon, the prime minister, opposed it, and, on all occasions, proved himself hostile to toleration, whether to Catholics or Presbyterians, it was laid on the table of the House. It was, however, resolved that there was no reason to alter the oaths of allegiance and supremacy; but after much explanation and debate, it was proposed to blot out the "sanguinary laws," as well as all other laws that rendered either priests and those that sheltered them, or those who acknowledged the Pope's authority, liable to the penalties of felony, of a præmunire, or of treason.

This prospect of relief, however, very soon grew dim, and then entirely vanished. One of Hyde's supporters, acting upon the maxims of Walsingham and the Cecils, purposely threw in an additional subject

for discussion, if not dissension, by suggesting that the proposed relief should not extend to the Jesuits.* The crafty statesman himself must have smiled at the success of the expedient. The Jesuits, indeed, pleaded, that they were willing to give securities equal to those of other Catholics; proved that their penitents had fought for the king; and showed, with regard to the Pope's deposing power, that, by an express command of the general of their order, they had been forbidden as far back as 1616 to maintain it either in word, writing, or print." The parliament, however, paid little attention to their representations; and the Catholics were perplexed and divided. Some said they would never separate their interests from those of the Jesuits. All were one in faith and in suffering. Let them still be one: undivided for good or evil fortune.

Some others, on the contrary, thought, that a part of the Catholic body ought to submit to the exception, for the common benefit. Whilst the Catholics were thus debating, the question was deferred by the peers, and the opportunity was lost. It would appear after all, that Charles was inclined to grant the Catholics "liberty of conscience;" that he was supported in this by a strong party in the House, headed by the earl of Bristol; but that "Chancellor Hyde was so hot upon that point, that his majesty was obliged to yield rather to his importunity than to his reasons." †

Not only did the Catholics thus fail to obtain any respite, they were not even excepted from the opera-

* "The earl of Clarendon set this on; for he knew well it would divide the Papists themselves. But though a few honest priests, such as Blacklow, Sergeant, Caron, and Walsh, were for it, yet they could not make a party among the leading men of their own side."—(Burnet's Hist. of his own Times, i. p. 194.) See Appendix, F.

† Kennett's Register and Chronicle, vol. i. pp. 472, 476, 484, 495, 496, 498, and 499. Kennett is almost entirely a collection of contemporary documents, pamphlets, passages from the journals of parliament, &c. &c. Kennett is rampant enough against Catholics whenever he himself speaks. He was bishop of Peterborough.

tion of laws directed against the Presbyterians. One of these statutes was the Corporation Act, which excluded from all corporations those who refused to take, amongst other tests, the oaths of supremacy and allegiance (Dec. 1661). Another was the Conventicle Act, which forbade any assemblage for religious purposes, except for the service recognized by law. Whenever such an assemblage consisted of more than five persons, over and above the members of the family in whose house they met, the first and second infractions of this law were punished with fine and imprisonment. A third offence was punished with a fine of one hundred pounds, or transportation to the slave-colonies for seven years (May 1664). Hitherto, despite of the severity of the laws, the Catholics had often met in great numbers; having little to fear, unless it could be proved that they were assembling to hear Mass. Now, the meeting itself was illegal. The prying eyes of informers need no longer seek a difficult access to a jealously guarded house: they had but to scan the byways of suspected localities, and their miserable work was done. *

Defrauded as the Catholics had been of the claims both of justice and gratitude, it was some consolation, that as long as the events of the civil war were remembered, they could no longer be branded as traitors. Even this drop of consolation was soon to be dashed from their lips. At first, merely a few symptoms of the old bitter spirit against them was from time to time displayed, and then it burst forth in one wild accusation against the whole body of Catholics, laity, and clergy. When the fire of 1666 had laid the greater part of London in ashes, the calamity was attributed to a Popish plot; and the city of London was not ashamed to inscribe upon the Monument this malicious accusation as a notorious fact. Within these few years the same city of London has shown its good sense and enlarged knowledge, by erasing an

* Stat. of the Realm, 13 & 16 Car. II.; Echard, pp. 795, &c.

inscription which was only a record of its own folly.

Soon after the fire, the parliament resumed its old war-cry, "No Popery." It did not, indeed, talk of treason, but it showed enough of its prying, crippling, spirit, to give some idea of its intentions, and some foretaste of its subsequent frenzy. At the same time, its proceedings favour us with an indistinct glimpse of the state of the poor Church in England. On the twenty-first of February, 1670, the House of Commons prepared an address to the throne, upon the "growth of Popery." Its chief points were the following:—

First.—That there were many priests and Jesuits in London, and most counties.

Second.—That there were several chapels besides the ambassadors', in various places, especially in the great towns.

Third.—That there were fraternities or convents of English "Popish priests" and Jesuits, at St. James's, and at the Coombe in Herefordshire; and others in other parts of the kingdom; besides several schools.

Tenth.—That Talbot, "the reputed archbishop of Dublin," was openly consecrated at Antwerp, and received by the Catholics in England, and, still more publicly, in Ireland.

As a remedy to these terrible symptoms, it was petitioned that the said convents and schools should be abolished; and that "the priests, Jesuits, friars, and schoolmasters, should be duly punished for such their insolencies."

On the following tenth of March, a conference took place between the Lords and Commons, upon the address; and in the result, as read to the Lords, the following porticulars were specified regarding the Catholics: "In an eminent Papist's house in Yorkshire, a bell was publicly rung to call people to Mass;" and upon a neighbouring member of parliament inquiring into the matter, he was told that "the said Mass-bell was commonly rung at the time proper for

it." Mass was, according to a trustworthy report, said in rooms at Osney, near Oxford; and in the Mitre Tavern, in Oxford; also at Worcester, Wolverhampton, Ripon, York, Winchester, at Lantarnam in Monmouthshire, at Abergavenny, at Lanarth, at Garway, and various neighbouring places; "besides the priests' at the Coombe." It was added, in explanation of the last-mentioned most portentous phrase, that, for some years past, six Popish priests or Jesuits lived at the Coombe, in a convent or fraternity, and that every week a horse-load or more of provisions was bought for their use, at the Monmouth market. The Coombe had afforded shelter to priests for nearly forty years; and contained "very artificial contrivances" for hiding such persons. It was moreover so situated, that persons could easily slip out into the neighbouring dense woods. Few people publicly showed themselves there; and the doors were almost always shut. Another member of parliament, who collected "the late taxes" there, said that besides the demesnes of the Coombe, producing about sixty pounds per annum, there was a dependent tenement close by which produced about forty pounds per annum.*

This address does not appear to have led to any very disastrous result. It was, however, plain that the elements for an explosion might easily be collected; and so it happened: in a few years, a combination of circumstances artfully guided, threw the nation into a ferment and revengeful passion, never before so vehement, even at the time of the Armada, or of the gunpowder treason. A political party, baffled on other points, and reckless of innocent blood, knew well how to profit by the cry of Popish treason. The old country party of Charles I.'s time, the antagonist of the court, had now thoroughly revived. Its ranks were swollen by all the various shades of republicans, from the most moderate Presbyterian who would tolerate a monarchy, to the soldier of Cromwell who

* Journals of the House of Commons and Journals of the House of Lords.

loved a military despotism, as long as it was called a protectorate or republic instead of a monarchy. Some of these parties had risen in arms since the Restoration; others had plotted with the Dutch, even when the latter were at war with England. They needed but a daring leader in order to dictate their own terms to the disgusted and divided Cavaliers. Such a leader now presented himself. Shaftesbury, thirsting for vengeance, because he thought himself ungenerously treated, and still more because deprived of office, drew all eyes upon himself, by his popular arts and his active opposition to the court. His eloquence, his studied condescension and affability, won the fickle crowd, and drew around him those unprincipled men who care for nothing but their selfish ends, as well as all the opponents both of tyranny and royalty. His decision and reckless energy, confirmed his ascendancy; humbled the royal ministry; made him for a time dictator to the king; and prepared the way for what he himself, indeed, did not live to see, the overthrow of the Stuart dynasty, and the establishment of a foreign Protestant upon the English throne.

The means by which all this was attained, belongs not to the object of the present history. Those points only which more directly affected the Catholic body need any remark, and this but a brief one, the true history of this period being thoroughly known and acknowledged by all parties.

Shaftesbury's efforts were directed chiefly against James, the brother of Charles and the royal heir-apparent. James had become a Catholic: this would afford a pretext for excluding him from the succession, and for overwhelming him in a storm of no-popery agitation. The first blow for this purpose was called, from the nature of its accompanying oath, a Test Act. By this act, all persons that held any office, civil, naval or military, even in the royal household, or that wished to sue at law, or that resided within thirty miles of London, were required to take the oaths of supremacy and allegiance; and, within three months,

to receive the Protestant communion, as well as to subscribe to a written denial of transubstantiation. James was thus obliged to resign the command of that fleet which he had so valiantly commanded in the terrific struggle with the Dutch.

The next blow, after a due preparation of false reports and other means of agitating, was a second and more sweeping Test. By this new measure, no persons could any longer take their seats in parliament, or even make their appearance either in the two houses or before the king, unless they had taken the two oaths, and subscribed not only to a denial of transubstantiation, but to a declaration, that "the invocation or adoration of the Virgin Mary or any other saint, and the sacrifice of the Mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous." Persons liable yet refusing the oath, were to be fined five hundred pounds, and to be treated as "Popish recusant convicts." Means were found by the court to insert James's name, as a special exception to this statute; thus defeating the chief object of Shaftesbury's party. Twenty-one Catholic lords, however, were thus, at the breath of a faction, stripped of their hereditary prerogatives (A.D. 1678). Three others saved their places, by taking the test and abandoning their religion.*

Before the second Test was carried, the partizans of Shaftesbury had alarmed the credulous multitude, by rumours of Popish plots, and by petitions to the king to fortify his palace and call out the militia. That there were no grounds for such rumours or petitions, signified little: the imagination of the ignorant or enthusiastic more than compensates for the absence of facts. Facts, however, such as they were, were now to be produced in abundance. Titus Oates, a minister of the Anglican establishment, whose character had long since been notoriously lost, came forward and swore to the existence of conspiracies,

* 25 Car. II. c. 2; and 30 Car. II. c. 1.

compared with which even the gunpowder plot would pale. The Jesuits, he said, were everywhere at work. They were in every variety of disguise; and were on the very eve of burning Westminster, Wapping, and the shipping on the Thames, of shooting the king, and of placing upon the throne a person nominated by the Pope.

When similar plots had been invented in the time of Elizabeth, the invention was due to the government, and although attended with considerable ferment, could scarcely produce a universal panic. The Catholics were then very numerous, and knew well how averse the great body of their clergy had ever been to conspiracy or bloodshed. In the time of Charles II. everything was different. The number of the Catholics had become insignificant. The Protestants, who now formed the bulk of the nation, having been from the cradle trained to regard them with distrust, and their religion with horror, no longer needed the exciting arts of the government, but was ever ready at any signal to fall upon the calumniated Catholics. When, therefore, Oates made his appearance, he was at once believed (A.D. 1678).

This is the more remarkable, as Oates's character was known to be thoroughly abandoned: gross misconduct had driven him from a chaplaincy in the royal fleet, and compelled him repeatedly to quit curacy after curacy. To add to this, his proofs were seldom or never conclusive, and often contradictory.* Yet he was believed; he was rewarded as a deliverer; he was attended by a guard, and (will future ages believe it?) was sumptuously lodged and fed in the royal palace of Whitehall.

Shaftesbury's party had adopted him as their tool

* The details of the trials have been so often laid before the public, that it appears unnecessary to repeat them. It will be sufficient to sum up in the words of Echard, a contemporary and a Protestant, being archdeacon of Stowe:—"And yet, after the strictest and coolest examinations, and after a full length of time, the government could find very little foundation to support so vast a fabric, besides downright swearing and assurance (vol. iii. p. 460; 1718).

against the royal brothers; and by processions, and appeals, and rumours, as well as by their own apparent earnestness, supported his failing credit. The royal ministers themselves (strange as it may seem) concurred with Shaftesbury and the opposition; for Danby, their chief, hoped by this means to escape a threatened impeachment. When once the court and the opposition had thus united, and when the parliament had declared that there existed "a damnable and hellish plot," it is scarcely to be wondered at that the mass of the people, trained to believe everything evil of Catholics, gave themselves up to the excitement, and frantically clamoured for blood.

In the storm thus raised, the Catholics possessed their startled souls in patience. When, indeed, they beheld the first symptoms of its approach (in May, 1674), some few laymen met, to petition parliament for a modified oath of allegiance different from the ordinary one, and yet not unlike it. The suggestion was, however, speedily abandoned; and Catholics, as in earlier stages of the persecution, awaited in prayer and redoubled fervour, the course of events. Rapidly did those events envelope them, hurrying multitudes of innocent victims to prison and the scaffold. Some thus seized and destroyed were priests, both seculars and religious; and some were laymen of all classes, and amongst them one peer, the aged noble-minded Lord Stafford (A.D. 1680).*

While the excitement was at its height, the various penal laws which had fallen into some abeyance, such as the fines for absence from church and the seizure of two-thirds of the real estate, were again enforced. Informers and pursuivants were again clamouring at

* Dodd, tom. iii. passim; and Dr. Godden's letter (of May 13th, 1674), ib. iii. p. 385; State Trials, and Echard's Hist. passim. The panic, if we may judge from letters of Cardinal Howard, Sergeant, and others, had induced two miserable Catholics to take even the oath of supremacy. As these were all the cases of the kind which the clergy could discover, we may conclude that there were not many more, and we may justly admire the firmness of the whole Catholic body.—See the documents in Dodd, iii. p. 383, &c.

the gates, or rifling and overturning in every apartment. Priests were again, as a few years before, executed, and sometimes for the mere fact of being priests. Such, for instance, was the only charge against Father Wall, the Franciscan, who was put to death at Worcester, and whose body lies in St. Oswald's churchyard (Aug. 22, 1679). Such, too, was the only charge against Father Kemble, who was executed at Wigmarsh, near Hereford, on the very day on which Father Wall was martyred at Worcester.

Kemble, now eighty years of age, was at Pemberton Castle, not far from Monmouth, when he was told that the pursuers were close at hand: he refused to escape. He was carried to London; but there being no accusation against him, he was led back for his trial and martyrdom to the county in which he had so long and zealously laboured. His tomb in the churchyard of Welsh Newton is still to be seen at the foot of the old stone cross, and from that day to the present time has ever been to the neighbouring Catholics a cherished object of pilgrimage.*

* Chall. Mem. part ii. The traditions of unrecorded sufferings soon fade; but in many places some distinct traces are still perceptible. Thus, in the mountainous districts on the Welsh side of Monmouth, we are still shown a farmyard, near which a poor priest expired in the snow, after being hunted from one place to another. Not far from that spot, in a vale where the embowering trees and the hollow ground make together something like a vast cavern, and where there is a stream brawling over large stones, a priest, caught by a savage mob, was, we are told, summarily beheaded. The country people are fond of saying that the blood-like stains so often seen upon stones, and found there in abundance, were indeed from the martyr's blood. Why should not Catholics who have leisure, catch up these fading traditions, and associate them with our beautiful English scenery? What poetry would be equal to it?

CHAPTER XXV.

JAMES II.—HIS UNRESTRAINED ZEAL—FATHER PETRE—FOUR VICARS APOSTOLIC APPOINTED—DR. LEYBURN—HIS OPPOSITION TO BLACKLOISM—SIR KENELM DIGBY—WHITE—HOLDEN—DR. LEYBURN'S VISITATION—DR. GIFFARD—DR. SMITH—DR. ELLIS—CLAIM OF THE BENEDICTINES—DECISION—THE REVOLUTION—DESTRUCTION OF CHAPELS—FATHER PALMER AND THE SAVOY—NEW LAWS AGAINST THE CATHOLICS.

When the troubled reign of Charles II. had terminated, and his brother, James II., had succeeded, the Catholics had been suffering persecution more or less violent and continuous for one hundred and sixteen years. All had been done that power, craft, and violence could do, to annihilate them, or at least to crush the survivors into the lowest depths of poverty, contempt, and ignorance. Now, at last, they obtained a brief respite.

As soon as James came to the throne, he began to show himself determined, whether over zealously or not, to promote the Catholic cause. He made Father Huddlestone, who had been summoned to the death-bed of Charles II., and had received that monarch into the Church, publish a detailed account of that event. He himself published some papers written by Charles in favour of the Catholic doctrine.

This, however, was little for one of James's temperament; he not only went to Mass, but went publicly with all the ensigns of royalty. He submitted, indeed, to the coronation rite, as then usually administered (excepting of course the Anglican Lord's supper); but soon proved that he was more ardent than even before, in the cause of the long-oppressed Catholics. He began to concert measures for bringing about, if not a repeal of the penal laws, at least a toleration in some form or other, not for Catholics only, but for all denominations.

It was unfortunate that his zeal was too little restrained by prudence; and still more unfortunate that he could not discriminate his real from his apparent friends. Sunderland, who had been deeply engaged in the schemes of Shaftesbury, now affected a leaning to Catholicity; and he was believed and confided in by the infatuated king. Under such guidance, James was led on from one rash step to another, until the conspiracy called the Revolution was fully matured. Another counsellor, the very opposite of Sunderland, in his guileless character, seems to have been too generally, from his unsuspicious openness of soul, the tool of the crafty minister. This was Father Edward Petre, one of those who had suffered imprisonment during the excitement of Oates's plot. Being of a noble family, and already known to James, he was invited to court, and became the king's most trusted adviser.

To these two James added four Catholic peers; and to this private council intrusted the accomplishment of his plan of toleration (A.D. 1856). The four peers were the Lords Bellasis, Powis, Arundell, and Dover. The result of their deliberations soon appeared. Colonel Hales, a Catholic gentleman, had accepted a military commission without having taken the test. His coachman, therefore, commenced a feigned suit against him. The colonel's defence was that he had received a dispensation from the king. This was pronounced a legitimate reason by the Lord Chief Justice Herbert, and by eleven out of the twelve judges. This was all that James wanted. Although the king's dispensing power had been strongly denied in the former reign, he overlooked or despised the danger of exerting it, and, outstepping, as many think, the limits of his prerogative, he henceforth suspended the penal laws at his pleasure; and having granted posts at the council-board, and in civil and military departments, to Catholics, proclaimed at last a general toleration both to Catholics and Dissenters.*

* Dalrymple's Mem. pp. 49, 91, 93, and 94; Oliver's Collect. Petre, F. Ed.; Mem. of Jas. II. (Clarke), vol. ii. pp. 74 and 75.

Whilst the Catholics were beginning to breathe more freely after their long oppression, an ecclesiastical measure was in contemplation which marks an epoch in their annals. Although the Pope considered James too hasty in some of his measures, he thought that the time was nevertheless come for the appointment, first, of one, and soon after of four vicars apostolic, or bishops acting directly in place of the Pope himself. The four persons chosen for this important office were John Leyburn, Dr. Bonaventure Giffard, Dr. James Smith, and Philip Ellis, a Benedictine. The Pope's nuncio, at the court of St. James's, the archbishop of Amasis, had divided England and Wales on this auspicious occasion into the four dioceses, called the London, the Midland, the Western, and the Northern districts.

Leyburn, who for more than two years was sole vicar apostolic, was as unobtrusive in manner as he was diminutive in person. He had been president of Douay, and Bishop Smith's vicar general, and had proved his zeal for the faith, not only against heresy, but against those insidious forms of error that partook more or less of the deadly leaven of Jansenism. One of these forms, although one perhaps the least baneful, was what became known for half a century as Blackloism. Blackloe was a secular priest, whose real name was White. He was not only a theologian but a skilful mathematician, and was an intimate friend both of Descartes and Hobbes. When Sir Kenelm Digby, well known for his controversial correspondence with Laud, had failed to induce the Holy See to appoint a successor to Bishop Smith, he had not the humility to submit cheerfully to a decision so much at variance with his own opinion. The bitterness which he thus allowed to spring up within him he expressed in his letters to White, and to Holden, the celebrated author of the "Analysis of Faith."* The feeling,

* In the reprint of this work in the Cursus Completus Theol., the first book has been omitted. The editor shrunk, as he tells us, from the responsibility of giving to the public what had incurred censure

instead of being soothed and moderated, was encouraged and reciprocated. For a moment all three brooded over the adoption of a plan, by which their disappointment seemed about to avenge itself in a suicidal act of schism. They thought it possible to induce one of the French prelates to consecrate a bishop for England, quieting their consciences with the hope that when the person had once received the episcopal character, it would be easy to obtain the sanction of the Holy See. Happily, grace prevailed, and they recoiled from their own monstrous idea. It was too late, however, for their popular repute: henceforth they became known as a party, under the name of Blackloists. What rendered this name indelible for the rest of the century, was a strong and very general suspicion that some of their writings were tinged with error, twenty-two propositions from one of White's works having been condemned by the University of Douay (A.D. 1660). His errors called forth a general, but temperate, repudiation from his brother clergy. Dr. Leyburn was the warmest of his opponents. It needed, however, but little effort to recall White to the path from which he had unintentionally strayed. He submitted fully, he replied, to the Church and the Holy See. When Dr. Leyburn pointed out the ambiguity of such an expression, he added others; and if he were at first wanting in a sufficiently explicit submission, he seems at last to have proved his humility, and his entire obedience to the Holy See. Dr. Leyburn's efforts in this matter, no less than his position as head of the college at Douay, drew general attention to his worth. Going afterwards to Rome, he became secretary and auditor of Cardinal Howard. He was there consecrated, in September, 1685, as vicar apostolic of all England. On arriving in England, he was provided with apartments in St. James's Palace, and received a yearly pension of one thousand pounds. Before the year of his consecration

in many of its propositions—"quasi male sonantibus, minusque orthodoxiæ germanis" (tom. vi. p. 790). See App. FF.

had closed, Dr. Leyburn, finding there was some want of uniformity,* issued an injunction that the Feasts of "the patrons of this kingdom and Church," Saints George and Thomas, should be kept on the 23rd April, and 29th December, with an octave; and that every Friday, "according to the custom of our Fathers," should be a fasting day, except the Fridays between Christmas and the Epiphany, and between Easter and the Ascension. He was engaged at the same time in a general visitation of the whole kingdom. It was nearly sixty years since a Catholic bishop had appeared in England, and nearly one hundred and thirty since any one had travelled unmolested in the discharge of his episcopal functions. He was thrown into the Tower at the Revolution, but was soon released, and although often summoned before the ministers of state, was only required to signify his place of abode. He died in 1703.

Dr. Giffard was a native of Wolverhampton, his family being a branch of the Giffards of Chillington. Some admonitions which his zeal for souls caused him to give to James, duke of York, were repaid by the latter, when king, with a royal chaplaincy. He was finally chosen bishop, being consecrated in April, 1687. For some months he seems to have had the care of one-half of England. When two other vicars apostolic were appointed, he became bishop of the Midland district. At the Revolution he was imprisoned in Newgate, but was released at the end of a twelvemonth. He survived until 1733, when he died at Hammersmith. He was remarkable for his unobtrusive but active charity.

Dr. Smith was a native of Hampshire. In 1682, he became president of Douay, having under his rule one hundred and forty masters and students. Whilst discharging this office he succeeded to a large paternal

* Various rubrics, as well as festivals, had long since crept in; whilst in some places the Roman rite prevailed, in others the Sarum, and in other again the Gallican.—See Fath. Lean. in Clarend. Pap. vol. i. p. 205.

estate, but granted the chief part to a younger brother. Being known to the queen, he was appointed one of the new vicars apostolic, being consecrated in Somerset House, in May, 1688. His district was the North. He was there greatly respected, even by the Protestants, for his polished Christian bearing, his prudent conduct during all the heat and changes of political factions, his general information, and his love of the poor. He died in 1711.

Dr. Ellis was a convert, being the son of a Protestant rector. Having become a Benedictine, he attracted attention by his eloquent sermons. He became a royal chaplain, and, finally, a vicar apostolic, being consecrated at St. James's Palace, in May, 1688, about a fortnight before the consecration of Dr. Smith. Like each of the other vicars apostolic, he was to receive an annual pension of one thousand pounds. At the Revolution he withdrew to France, and then to Italy, where he died.*

Soon after the consecration of the four bishops, the Benedictines thought it time to claim their ancient rights with regard to certain English sees. The old English Benedictines were not distinct as a province from their present successors. They had, indeed, at one time only a single representative, Father Buckley, one of the restored Westminster community in the time of Mary. He, however, when in extreme old age, gave the habit to several others.† Being thus linked to the ancient order, the Benedictines seem to have thought that they might by silence forfeit some of the rights of their predecessors. They, therefore, made known their claim, and it was communicated to Rome by the vicars apostolic, but was waived by the Holy See.

It was finally decreed, that by the appointment of

* Dodd (Lives of Bishops), iii. p. 466, fol. and p. 528. See also Histor. Mem. vol. iv. p. 112, &c.; Hoburg, ap. Plowden's Panzani, No. 10, p. 363.

† See supra, p. 302, and note, and p. 323.

the vicars apostolic (Oct. 5, 1696), "every kind of jurisdiction ceased, and does cease, of chapters of vicars capitular, both secular and regular," as long as vicars apostolic continue; and that all regulars, even Jesuits and Benedictines, were to be subject to the vicar in whose district they were, for approbation with regard to hearing confessions, for the cure of souls, and for all parochial offices.*

Nearly eight years before this decision had arrived, and, indeed, almost immediately after the vicars apostolic had been appointed, the Revolution suddenly developed its deep-laid schemes, destroyed the dynasty of the Stuarts, and again placed a Protestant and a persecutor upon the English throne.

During the heat of the Revolution Catholic chapels were ruthlessly destroyed. In Mass-house Lane, in Birmingham, one had been erected, chiefly by the aid of the Reeves of Rowington and Edgbaston. It had been consecrated by Bishop Giffard, the vicar apostolic, September 4th, 1688: on the 10th of the following December it was demolished by the rabble.†

In Wigan, the foundations of an intended church were torn up and scattered to the winds. The ten colleges, which the Jesuits had established in various places, vanished in the confusion of the time.‡ The clergy, meanwhile, were actively hunted down. Father Petre especially was an object of eager search: he contrived, however, to reach the Continent unharmed.§

* Innoc. XII.; Const. 80; Oct. 5, 1696, in Mag. Bull. See also Dodd, iii. p. 529, &c.

† See Register of Father Randolf, preserved at St. Peter's, Birmingham, quoted by Dr. Oliver, Collections, note p. 178.

‡ Ib. note, p. 186.

§ Father Petre's correspondence was long preserved in his Order in Belgium. At the suppression, they were under the care of Father Charles Plowden, who assured the Rev. H. Campbell, of Grafton Manor, that the collection had been read by him, and was a complete exculpation of Father Petre from the charge of precipitancy. These

Less fortunate was Father Palmer. This holy and learned Jesuit had for many months, during Oates's plot, been tracked from place to place, at the vengeful instigation of Travers, himself a "professed" but apostate Jesuit. Having escaped this danger, Father Palmer was appointed rector of the college which was established in the half-ruinous Savoy. This ancient building, or rather collection of buildings, James had transferred to the society, and here Father Palmer ruled about two hundred Catholics, and as many Protestants, the latter being under no religious constraint, and the institution being open to all comers, provided they were fit to begin Latin. When James had fled, Father Palmer endeavoured to follow, but, being well known, was seized at Faversham, and was despoiled and thrown into prison. There he suffered many indignities; and although it was the depth of winter, and he was seventy-four years of age, he was for an entire fortnight without so much as a bed. Being removed to Newgate, he there, in little more than a month, sank under his hardships. His last dying prayer was the loving hymn of St. Francis Xavier: "O Deus, amo Te." *

While chapels, schools, and clergy were thus involved in new calamities, new penal statutes were in preparation.

As soon as William III. had secured the throne of England, the Toleration Act was passed, in order to rescue dissenters from various penalties. The Catholics, on the other hand, so far from being favoured, were once more commanded to remove ten miles from

valuable documents being seized at the suppression, and falling into the hands of the Walloons during their struggle in the French Revolution, were carried off, and have never since been recovered.

* See Oliver's Collect. and ib. notes to p. 178 and 186; Stowe's Survey, Strype's ed. vol. ii. p. 107 (1720); letter from a Jes. in Echard, iii. p. 1083; Mem. of Jas. II. vol. ii. pp. 79, 80, and 256, &c. The Franciscans, as the Memoirs tell us, had settled in Lincoln's-Inn Fields, as well as in Birmingham; and the Carmelites in the City.

Westminster, to forego the use of arms, or the possession of any horse of the value of more than five pounds; as well as to submit to have the test administered to them, and on its being refused, to be proceeded against as "recusant convicts," or, in other words, to be subjected, without further process, to all the punishments of the penal code.*

Grievous as was this measure, harsh as was the general treatment of Catholics, blood ceased to flow, and the prisons were no longer crowded with confessors. So far Catholics might be grateful. No feelings, however, may close the mouths of the clergy: "Go and preach the Gospel to every creature," is their unchanging commission. Therefore did they take advantage of the lessening of persecution to enter England in greater numbers than before, and to exert themselves, not indeed ostentatiously, but certainly with a zeal not the less active for being prudent.

This increased activity was turned by the parliament to a political purpose. The party in opposition introduced a bill against the Catholics, in hopes that the court would incur odium by rejecting it. When they found that the court was not thus to be entrapped, they added clauses still more severe. The court, however, supported even these alterations; and thus the Catholics were made the victims of the modern art of politics. By this new statute, the test was added to the oaths required by the penal laws of James I.: heirs to any estate, if they were thought to be Catholics, were required at the age of eighteen to take the oaths of supremacy and allegiance, and when of age, to take the test, on pain of the estate passing, until the oaths were taken, to the nearest Protestant relative. All Catholics were made incapable of purchasing lands. All priests, moreover, and all Catholics whatever who were convicted of "boarding"

* Stat. of the Realm, 1 Will. and Mary, c. 9, 15, 17, 18. For the new oath of allegiance oath, see App. G.

or educating youth, were to be punished with perpetual imprisonment; and the informer was, in the event of their being convicted of saying Mass or exercising any other priestly function, to be rewarded in each case from the royal treasury, with the sum of one hundred pounds (A.D. 1699).*

* Stat. of the Realm, 11 Will. III. c. 4, "An Act for the further preventing the growth of Popery." Burn.'s Own Times.

CHAPTER XXVI.

CONTINUANCE OF PERSECUTION—WALPOLE'S ASSESSMENT OF CATHOLICS—SOME REMONSTRANCES HEARD—SOME NEW PENAL LAWS—SCHOOLS—SEDGLEY PARK—DR. CHALLONER—HIS ANSWER TO MIDDLETON, AND FLIGHT FROM THE COUNTRY—HIS MANNER OF LIFE—DR. WALMSLEY—HIS PASTORINI—DR. HORNYOLD—HIS COURAGEOUS ZEAL—HIS ESCAPES—THE RULES OF THE MISSION.

When William III. and Anne were no more, the crown passed, by a recent act of parliament, to the next Protestant heirs, the German princes of the House of Hanover. The Jacobites, however, as those were termed who contended that the hereditary rights of James's children could not thus be annulled, were very numerous, and comprised persons of every class and almost every sect.

As it was known that some of the Catholics were of this party, and as their tenacious loyalty to the two Charleses was undeniable, they were reputed to be, as a body, either actual Jacobites, or at least favourably disposed to the Jacobites. This afforded Walpole, a minister who did not look too closely at the principles of justice, with a pretext for levying, in addition to to the double land-tax for every "reputed Papist," a tax of one hundred thousand pounds upon the estates of the impoverished Catholics.

To punish men not proved to be guilty, even when those men were the hated "Papists," was no longer so easy a task as formerly. The manifest and outrageous falsehoods alleged against them during the excitement of Oates's feigned discoveries, had produced a reaction; had made many suspect that other charges against the Catholics were equally illusory. When, therefore, Walpole proposed a land-tax, and, as usual, proposed that Catholics should pay double,* some

* This doubling of the tax was usual even whilst the taxes were

remonstrance, however feeble, was, perhaps for the first time, heard in favour of those whom hitherto all classes had conspired to persecute. Walpole was obliged to reply. The Papists, he said, had been constantly endeavouring, "by the most cruel, violent, and unjustifiable methods," "to subvert our happy constitution, and the Protestant religion." Many of them had been engaged in the late insurrection at Preston, and, therefore, they ought to bear an extraordinary share of the expenses to which they had subjected the nation.

By this vague repetition of old calumnies, and by the bold assertion, wrapped in some intentional obscurity, that because some had risen in the cause of James, therefore all ought to be punished, Walpole was able to check, at once, an opposition as feeble as it was unusual. The fact, however, of some remonstrance, no less than the cessation of martyrdom, marks a new era (Nov. 1722).

Penal laws, it is true, were still passed or re-enacted, and often enforced. Thus, if a Catholic enlisted without declaring his religion, he was to be corporally punished, in any manner short of death. If estates were applied to what the law calls superstitious uses, they were liable to be forfeited.*

Calamitous as the times still were, the Catholics breathed more freely. Some of the middling and humbler classes, immediately sought in a few dames' schools, for that Catholic education which the richer sought in the various seminaries. There were even some attempts to establish a higher kind of school. Thus, for a time, at Red Marley, between Gloucester and Ledbury, a school was maintained by the Benedictines. Such schools, being very few and very

assessed upon money. (Amongst other instances, see 4 Will. and Mary, c. 1, No. 34; and 6 and 7 Will. and Mary, c. 3, No. 45.) As soon as they began to be assessed upon land, it became an invariable rule.—See Stat. of the Realm, 1 Anne, stat. 2, c. 1; 7 Anne, c. 1, No. 58; 8 Anne, c. 1, No. 60; and 10 and 12 Anne, c. 1, No. 58, &c.

* Stat. 1 (p. 152 and c. 47 and 50), 3 (p. 199), and 4 Geo. I. (p. 36, &c.), as printed at the time by authority; also Coxe's Walp.

obscure, remained undisturbed. This impunity gave boldness. A kind of Little Seminary, under the form at first of a proprietary school, sprang into existence at Sedgley Park, near Wolverhampton. Its cradle, indeed, was in some distant locality, but its existence about the middle of the century at Newcastle-under-Lyme, is certain. In a few years it was transferred to its present site, near Wolverhampton (A.D. 1763). Dr. Challoner, of the London District, was its especial patron and promoter. His intimate friend, the Rev. William Errington, was its immediate head. The house hired for this purpose, was a residence belonging to the family of Lord Dudley and Ward. Mr. Errington dying in 1768, "his representatives," says Dr. Milner, "showed themselves unwilling to charge themselves with so hazardous a business as this large establishment was." It was therefore transferred to Dr. Hornyold, of the Midland District.

Dr. Milner was amongst its earliest alumni. Of the bishops now ruling the Catholic Church in this country, Dr. Briggs of Beverley, Dr. Waraing of Northampton, and Dr. Brown of Shrewsbury, were all members of this establishment, so justly termed by Dr. Milner, a "nursery of priests." *

Great difficulties, the details of which seem to have perished, beset the infant establishment: it was maintained, we are vaguely told, "in defiance of the rude opposition of malice, and the too cautious foresight of worldly wisdom." As it was Dr. Challoner who bore the brunt of this conflict, he is justly termed its "life and principal founder."†

This exemplary bishop, when as yet very young, was converted from Protestantism, and afterwards sent to Douay (A.D. 1704), by the learned Gother. This priest, himself brought up at Douay, first became generally known by his controverial writings, in the

* Dr. Milner's Hist. of Bishop Hornyold, Husenbeth's Sedgley Park, &c.

† Dr. Milner's Funeral Discourse on the death of the Ven. and Right Rev. Richard Challoner, p. 10, London, 1781.

time of James II. His numerous works are still to be found in almost every Catholic library. The works of Challoner, however, are better known than those of his first spiritual father. Dryden, no ordinary judge, is said to have been an admirer of Gother's style; but the reader of Challoner generally forgets the style, being either absorbed in the subject-matter, or moved by the sweet devotional spirit which breathes in every page. His "Memoirs of Missionary Priests," are a striking proof of his accuracy, research, and moderation. His "Meditations," and his "Think Well On't," are household books.

When Challoner had finished his course of studies at Douay, he was found too useful to the college to be allowed to enter at once upon the mission. Not until he had been there six-and-twenty years, was he allowed to depart. When, at last, he began to labour upon the London mission, he shone as a bright light to all that knew him. He was accessible, abstemious, and devoted to every branch of his duties. Early every evening he was to be found at his own house, ready to give advice, to instruct children, or to attend sick calls. Whatever time remained, after the discharge of these duties and of his private devotions, he employed in writing useful treatises. Thus, in 1737, he wrote the "Catholic Christian Instructed," in answer to Dr. Conyers Middleton's "Conformity between Popery and Paganism." This conclusive reply so provoked Middleton and his friends, that they endeavoured to procure his arrest, under pretence of his being disaffected to the government. He therefore withdrew to the Continent.

In the following year, on the death of Dr. Witham, the president of Douay (May 29, 1738), the other superiors petitioned the Holy See that Dr. Challoner should be the new president. It was referred to Dr. Petre, the vicar apostolic of the London District. This bishop was now growing old; and therefore, instead of attending to the petition, he demanded that Challoner should be made his coadjutor. An animated

contest immediately arose, and terminated in Challoner being consecrated as Dr. Petre had desired (Jan. 29, 1741). Dr. Petre survived his consecration seventeen years, dying in 1758.

Being thus made bishop, Challoner began, and ever after continued, to preach every Sunday, even "in the worst of times," as Milner testifies, "while an obscure retreat was to be found to shelter his poor audience." This allusion refers to the period of Payne's prosecutions, mentioned in the following chapter. Overflowing with every kind of spiritual knowledge, and devoted to prayer, he seldom needed more than half an hour to prepare for the pulpit. His sermons were unadorned; but clear, nervous, and instructive. They were delivered without much gesture; but with unction, and an earnestness that made his countenance appear on fire. Now that he was bishop, he was more exact than even before, in the disposal of his time. Thus with regard to the early part of the day, he invariably rose at six. Ejaculatory prayers occupied his mind until he left his room. An hour's meditation followed. Then the preparation for Mass, and at eight, or on Sundays and holidays at nine, the Mass itself. The rest of the day corresponded with so good a beginning.*

The excellent custom of the vicar apostolic's holding with his clergy a spiritual conference once every week, was revived and maintained by this zealous servant of God. One of the most important features of these conferences was the discourse. This treated of the duties of the ecclesiastical state, and the Last Things or other important truths. These topics were assigned beforehand to those that tendered their services. The bishop himself, however, was frequently the preacher. His own chosen subjects were generally upon the necessity of daily meditation, of an annual retreat of eight or ten days, and of a life of continual prayer. The discourse being concluded, any one was at liberty to

* Barnard's Life of Challoner, London, 1784, pp. 2, 17, 38—40, 62, 68, 77—84, 105, and 130.

add whatever he pleased upon the same subject. Cases of conscience were then solved, and the conference closed.*

Amongst those friends and contemporaries of Dr. Challoner, who were not inferior to himself in their learned works and exemplary lives, were the two vicars apostolic, Dr. Walmesley and Dr. Hornyold.

The former was a Benedictine. He was born of an ancient family, in Lancashire (A.D. 1722). His boyhood must have been familiar with the then recent works of Gother, Hawarden, and Manning. Growing up, he completed his studies in the university of Paris. He soon acquired a European reputation for his knowledge of mathematics and astronomy, becoming a Fellow of the Royal Societies of London and Berlin. When the legislature saw, at last, the absurdity of clinging to the old style, and determined to introduce the new,† Dr. Walmesley was one of the learned men employed for that purpose. He is better known to the present generation as the author of an Explanation of the Apocalypse, which he published under the assumed name of Pastorini. It supplanted the extravagant theories of Newton, and was translated into French, German, Italian, and Latin. Thoroughly imbued with the spirit of the inspired book, as if on the very eve of the Last Day, he used often, in the presence of his intimate friends, to repeat the warning of Moses: "Adesse festinant tempora;"—The time is hastening to come.‡

This accomplished prelate long survived both Dr. Hornyold and Dr. Challoner. Dr. Hornyold, the vicar apostolic of the Midland district, the second founder of Sedgley Park, and the well-known author of the

* Ib. pp. 141, 142.

† In March, 1584-5, a bill was introduced into parliament "to alter and new make a calendar, according to the calendar used in other countries." It was twice read, and then apparently withdrawn. —Journ of the Lords, ii. pp. 99 and 102.

‡ See article "Bishop Walmesley," in the Catholic Directory of A.D. 1808; also the fifth edition of Pastorini, "The Editor to the Public," Dublin, 1812; and the Cath. Gent.'s Mag. 1818, p. 796.

"Commandments" and "Sacraments," was a descendant of the Hornyolds of Hanley Castle, between the Malvern Hills and the Severn. Having studied and received ordination at Douay, he entered upon his first mission at Grantham. He soon became remarkable for zeal and courage. Once "in the midst of a terrible storm," he was informed that one of his flock, who was at a distance, was in danger of death. He immediately set out, and "swam his horse through a river swollen with a flood, with imminent danger of being drowned. On another occasion, the constables coming to seize upon him as a Catholic priest just when he was finishing Mass, he could barely save himself by substituting a female cap for his flowing periwig, and throwing a large woman's cloak over his vestments, and in this disguise throwing himself in a corner of the room into the attitude of prayer." *

Whilst chaplain, some time after, to Mrs. Giffard at Longbirch, near Wolverhampton, he was selected by the vicar apostolic, Dr. Talbot Stonor, to be his coadjutor (Dec. 1752). He still made Longbirch his residence; but was "most assiduous in making his pastoral visits throughout the whole of the district, and even in supplying the places of the clergy, who for various causes were occasionally absent." His labours may be imagined, when it is remembered that no railroads as yet existed, and that his district extended from Yarmouth, on the German Ocean, to the Malvern Hills and the West of Shropshire, and from Barton-on-Humber and the North of Derbyshire to Oxford and Henley-on-Thames. "He was indefatigable in preaching the word of God both at home and abroad; and such was his faith and fervour in the discharge of this duty, that his eyes at those times generally overflowed with tears." Once when riding upon one of his pas-

* See his life, by Dr. Milner (under his usual initials, "J. M."). It is quite refreshing, amidst the dry fragments of the last century, to meet with so masterly and so trustworthy a sketch as this of Bishop Hornyold. I have incorporated nearly the whole of it into the text.

toral visitations, coming to where the road opened into two, "he could not with all his force and management make his horse go the way he was desirous of travelling; he therefore let the beast go the other road. He had not proceeded far in this, when he found a poor traveller lying on a bank, and near expiring. Approaching him, and inquiring of the sick man what he could do to relieve him, the latter exclaimed, 'I want a priest; for God's sake procure me a Catholic priest.' On this, Bishop Hornyold assured the dying man that he himself was a priest, and also a bishop. It is needless to describe the joy of the penitent, or the charity and zeal of the confessor: let it suffice to say, that having received the sick man's confession, and administered the Holy Viaticum and Extreme Unction to him, for the administration of both which sacraments it was the merciful Providence of God that he should be at the time provided, he remained with the poor object of his pastoral care until he witnessed his happy end.*

"During the lifetime of Bishop Stonor, that is, till the year 1756, our prelate had the satisfaction of witnessing the establishment of the Rules of the Mission, in obtaining which the former was chiefly instrumental, through the agency of the Rev. Mr. Diconson, afterwards bishop in the North. These Rules put an end to a world of dissension and confusion which had previously existed. He had also, during the same time, the mortification to witness the passing of the Marriage Act,† which all the English prelates and other eminent divines of that period considered as a greater grievance, on account of the sacrileges and other evils which it occasions, than all the penal laws then in force put together. The legis-

* The well-known anecdote of Bishop Hay and the Highland shepherd is strikingly similar. Had they happened ages before, modern shrewdness would no doubt have discovered something suspicious in the similarity. They are both, however, well authenticated.

† It required all marriages to be performed in the Protestant churches; see 26 Geo. II. c. 33.

lature meant nothing hostile to the Catholic religion by that act, but it could not then relieve us, as the existence of Catholic priests was not acknowledged by the laws. Bishop Hornyold, as well as several other of our clergy, were sometimes molested by those laws; particularly on one occasion, when a military character at Brewood was bent on seizing and prosecuting him, during which time the bishop remained concealed in one of the Longbirch barns.

"He kept up a close correspondence with the venerable Bishop Challoner, and occasionally remitted money to him to supply his wants; he also corresponded with the learned Alban Butler, who belonged to his district, and with several other distinguished men. Several letters from the two above-mentioned personages are still preserved.

"Though occupied with such weighty concerns and engaged in such serious studies, as likewise with prayer, meditation, &c., and though he was most abstemious and mortified in his way of living, he was cheerful and good-humoured, as his friends in general testify, and particularly those clergymen who, in succession, were his chaplains; for his custom was, as far as was practicable, to take the young priests who were sent on the mission into his house, and there to prepare them for undertaking the important duties of pastors. At length, finding his health decay, and that he was incapable of travelling, he pitched upon the Hon. and Rev. Thomas Talbot, whose brother had been made, eight years before, coadjutor to Bishop Challoner, to be his coadjutor. This choice was a thunderbolt to the humble Mr. Thomas Talbot; and the united efforts of all the Catholic prelates, of Alban Butler, and of the most respectable characters in England, could not for a long time overcome his objections and repugnance to rise above the condition of a poor laborious missionary. Pregnant proofs of all this are upon record. Being at length unable to withstand so violent an assault and such powerful means as were employed against him, he was forced to submit, and,

in 1776, he was consecrated Bishop of Acon. As to Bishop Hornyold, he continued to bear his infirmities and sufferings with the utmost patience and the most cheerful resignation to the adorable will of God, till December, 1778, when he died the death of the saints, and went, we trust, to receive that never-fading crown which the Prince of pastors has prepared for those who feed the flock of God, not by constraint, but willingly according to God; nor for filthy lucre's sake, but voluntarily being made a pattern to the flock. He was buried in Brewood church, where an humble stone records his name."*

The rules of the mission referred to in the above account of Bishop Hornyold, are those laid down in the bull addressed by Benedict XIV. to the vicars apostolic, and to all the missionaries apostolic, both secular and regular. It sufficiently points out, even whilst it terminates, the questions which had arisen.

In this letter the Pope first reminded them of Christ's admonition to his apostles, to love one another, and thus completing the work intrusted to them, to secure their reward in heaven. "Nothing," he continued, "can be more afflicting to us than to hear that there are divisions amongst you, through which the propagation of the Catholic faith and the salvation of Christians is retarded." Wishing to heal what has caused us most profound grief, we have accurately examined the arguments alleged on both sides; we have submitted what has thus been examined to some of the cardinals; and, upon consulting them personally, have found their sentiments to agree precisely with our own. We, therefore, enjoin you to obey strictly the following decrees:—

Let nothing whatever be changed regarding the four vicars apostolic. Let them exercise and enjoy within their respective districts all that authority which any ordinary possesses within his diocese. Let them, moreover, communicate to their priests the same

* Dr. Milner's Life of the Right Rev. John Hornyold.

powers which they themselves thus hold, except that which is strictly peculiar to the episcopal order, or which cannot be exercised without the use of the holy oils.

In the seminaries for supplying England with priests, let no care be wanting to make the alumni excel in piety, genius, and learning, as well as to be skilled in ecclesiastical functions, and, as far as possible, in the Gregorian Chant. Of the college at Douay, an account has been received from the president which has done him honour. Of that at Rome, intrusted to the care of the Jesuits, a visitation by two cardinals has been made, and various statutes in 1739 were published. Of the colleges at Lisbon, Paris, Seville, and Valladolid, no precise information has been as yet obtained; but the duty of obtaining such information has been intrusted to the secretary of the Propaganda, and to one of the cardinals.

As it is a general rule that religious should hold their jurisdiction direct from the Holy See, it will be necessary to fix a limit to this exemption from the jurisdiction of their ordinary. They are, therefore, on first arriving in any of the four dioceses, to produce to the bishop, or to his vicars general, or vicars foran, the usual testimonials of ordination, and of freedom from the impediments of suspension and irregularity. They are also, in accordance with the regulations of the Council of Trent, to submit themselves to the examination, and receive the permission of the ordinary, before they attempt to hear the confessions of the laity. As, however, this might oblige them to undertake long journeys which might deter them from their apostolical work, such examination may be made by the ordinary of that diocese in which the monastery of the said religious is situated.

The privileges conceded by Urban VIII., in 1631 and 1633, were adapted to a state of things in which vicars apostolic, with the full powers of ordinaries, did not exist. Let, therefore, such privileges cease, and all obtain faculties, as Innocent XII. decreed (Feb. 14, 1702), from the ordinary, before they admi-

nister the sacraments or discharge any parochial duty. Let all, both secular and religious, missionaries be subject in all such matters to the jurisdiction, visitation, and correction of their respective vicars apostolic.

Having laid down in the next place a rule for the bishops and the superiors of religious orders, with regard to the punishment of any religious who might transgress, Benedict urges the secular missionaries to devote themselves to the celebration of the divine offices, the instruction of their people, and the care of the sick, avoiding places of public resort,* and, while carefully instructing earnest converts, abstaining from the reception of those who, being not in earnest, or not thoroughly instructed, are rather a loss than a gain.

Having addressed similar exhortations to the regulars, he withdrew from them the privilege of granting the indulgences peculiar to their respective orders, reserving this to the vicars apostolic, to whom he gave the power of imparting a plenary indulgence four times every year, upon such festivals as seemed to them most suitable (May 30, 1753).†

* "Ut a publicis otiorum cœtibus et cauponis omnimodo caveant." "Addita etiam suspensionis pœna cuilibet, si quis ad easdem divertere non vereretur."

† Magn. Bullar. tom. xix. No. 16.

CHAPTER XXVII.

PRESSURE OF THE PENAL LAWS—PAYNE THE INFORMER—PROSECUTIONS OF DR. CHALLONER AND HIS COADJUTOR DR. TALBOT—MALONY IMPRISONED FOR LIFE—CHAPELS CLOSED AND PRIESTS DISPERSED—THE RELIEF BILL OF 1778—TRE REASONS WHY PROTESTANTS DEMANDED IT: SIR GEORGE SAVILLE'S SPEECH AND DUNNING'S SUMMARY—CLAMOUR OF THE METHODISTS AND OTHER DISSENTERS AGAINST THE BILL—WESLEY AND O'LEARY—MEETING IN ST. GEORGE'S FIELDS—PROCESSION TO THE PARLIAMENT HOUSE—PETITION—TUMULT—RIOTS OF 1780—DEATH OF DR. CHALLONER—HIS WONDERFUL INDUSTRY—HIS VENERATION FOR ST. VINCENT OF PAUL.

THE persecution from which Bishop Hornyold had, more than once, so narrowly escaped, fell more or less upon Catholics in every part of England. "That severe law, which deprives Catholics of landed property, is daily put in execution," is the brief but expressive testimony of an eye-witness.* In similar terms Charles Butler tells us, that "in many instances the laws which deprived the Catholics of their landed property were enforced: cases of this nature are mentioned in the law reports. In other respects," the same writer continues, "the Catholics were subject to great vexation and contumely. No Catholic, who was not alive in those times, can imagine the depression and humiliation under which the body laboured."†

* "Considerations on the Penal Laws," by a Country Gentleman; London, 1764.

† Ch. But. Histor. Mem. of Engl. Cath. vol. ii. c. 35, p. 63, 2nd ed. Butler's successful pursuits as a great conveyancer left him but few intervals for the study of history. How much he is at a loss in this extensive field of study is obvious at a glance. He gravely tells us, for instance, and that even in his second edition, that "Gregory VII." sent a legate to demand the homage of "Henry II." (vol. i. p. 43). He tells us, likewise, that the troubles caused by the Albigenses were in the ninth and tenth centuries (vol. i. p. 109). In short, his

One of the many causes of their afflictions, was the law which awarded a hundred pounds to any successful informer. What might be done by even one informer, and especially if he were supported by any hostile party, was lamentably displayed in a series of persevering, although often defeated, prosecutions.

In the course of 1765, a mechanic, named Payne, urged on, it was thought, not only by his longing for the informer's reward of a hundred pounds, but by some persons of respectability, began a vexatious system of prosecutions against Dr. Challoner, his co-adjutor Dr. James Talbot, and not a few of their clergy, and other Catholics. The Lord Mayor, when applied to, refused to assist the informer, and induced the bishop of London to follow his example. Although an illiterate man, Payne was so well schooled that he presented bills of indictment in the Old Bailey; and, notwithstanding the reluctance of the grand jury, secured a prosecution, and obtained a conviction against John Baptist Malony for being a priest. Malony obtained, therefore, the crown of a confessor, being imprisoned for life, first in the new gaol in Southwark, and afterwards in the King's Bench. Having thus secured a hundred pounds, the informer redoubled his efforts to procure convictions, and reap fresh golden harvests. From 1765 to 1778 he continued his exertions; and, says Barnard, "for the first seven years scarce a week passed but Dr. Challoner had some fresh account brought to him, either of some priest being arrested, some steps that were taken by the informer in carrying on his prosecution against some one or other of those whom he had under bail, some appearance to be put in and new bail given, or some trial to come on; or else of his endeavouring to steal *incog.* into some of the chapels, that he might lay a new information against

Memoirs, useful as they really are, yet abound with inaccuracies, and, except in quotations and disquisitions regarding the law, can seldom be fully relied upon. To rectify some of his errors, Dr. Milner wrote, perhaps too warmly, his excellent Supplementary Memoirs.

the priests; or of his going, accompanied with a number of others of his crew, and some constables, to the chapel-doors, and endeavouring to force his way in; which frequently obliged those who were present to keep the doors close shut, and thereby hindered several Catholics from attending." The result was that several chapels were shut up, the priests scattered, and Mass and preaching interrupted.*

The pertinacity and success of the informer, although so repeatedly thwarted seem to have inclined reflecting men to remove the cause of the mischief, by abrogating the law of William III. This, added to the dangers of the American war, when hostile navies were threatening the shores of England and still more of Ireland, made government thoroughly in earnest to conciliate all classes and creeds.

The friendly protection thus extended, awakened on the other hand the gratitude of the Catholic body; and, the cause of the Stuarts being hopeless, they tendered their full allegiance to the house of Hanover. It was accepted, a loyal address being presented and received.

Lord North's administration having now thrown out a hint of their intention to relax the penal code, the English Catholics named Sheldon, a gentleman of ancient family, as their secretary. He acted with such prudence that he obtained, in all his measures, the unanimous concurrence of the Catholics. The religious portion of the intended statute, and especially a new oath of allegiance, he, as well as Lord Petre and others, submitted to the vicars apostolic. This oath, as Dr. Challoner remarked, contained something to which Rome would probably object if consulted beforehand, but which it would tolerate if informed after the measure had passed. This oath, besides its general declaration of allegiance, abjured the Stuarts, and called God to witness that excommunicated princes could not be deposed "by their sub-

* Life of Challon. (Barnard's), pp. 156—162, 165; Milner's Sup. Mem. p. 42; see App. GG.

jects, or any person whatsoever," and that the Pope had "no temporal or civil jurisdiction," or power, "directly or indirectly, within this realm." This oath not being objected to by the vicars apostolic, and everything being arranged, the measure was introduced by Sir George Saville and the celebrated Dunning, and was carried without opposition. It swept away the most oppressive clauses of the statute of William III.*

The grounds upon which Protestants had thus claimed and secured justice, not, indeed, in the name of justice, but as an indulgence, are interesting in themselves, and present to our view, under a new aspect, the sufferings of the Catholic Church in England. Sir George Saville, when proposing this relief bill, said, that "he did not meddle with the vast body of that penal code; but selected that act, on which he found most of the prosecutions had been formed, and which gave the greatest scope to the base views of interested relations, and of informers for reward. The act had not, indeed, been regularly put in execution, but sometimes it had; and he understood that several lived under great terror, and some under actual contribution, in consequence of the powers given by it. As an inducement to the repeal of those penalties which were directed with such a violence of severity against Papists, he stated the peaceable and loyal behaviour of that part of the people, under a government which, though not rigorous in enforcing, yet suffered such intolerable penalties and disqualifications to stand against them on the statutes.

"A late loyal and excellent address, which they had presented to the throne, stood high among the instances which Sir George pointed out,† of the safety and good consequences which were likely to attend this liberal procedure of parliament. He observed

* Milner's Sup. Mem. p. 42; Stat. at Large, 18 Geo. III. c. 60; see also Butler's Hist. Memoirs, vol. ii. p. 82; vol. iv. chap. 79, p. 389 (1821). For the new oath of allegiance, &c. see App. H.

† The report here given is that of the Ann. Reg. for 1778, ap. Butl.

that, in the address, they not only expressed their obedience to the government under which they lived, but their attachment to the constitution upon which the civil rights of this country have been established by the Revolution, and which placed the present family upon the throne of these kingdoms. As a further guard and security, however, against any possible consequence of the measure, he proposed that a sufficient test might be formed, by which they should bind themselves to the support of the civil government by law established.

"The motion was seconded by Mr. Dunning, who, with his well-known ability and knowledge in such subjects, went into a legal discussion of the principal objects and past operation of the bill which was intended to be repealed. The following he stated as the great and grievous penalties:—the punishment of popish priests, or Jesuits, who should be found to teach, or officiate in the services of that church; which acts were felony in foreigners, and high treason in the natives of this kingdom: the forfeitures of popish heirs who had received their education abroad, and whose estates went to the next Protestant heir: the power given to the son, or other nearest relation, being a Protestant, to take possession of the father's or other relation's estate, during the life of the real proprietor: and the depriving of Papists of the power of acquiring any legal property by purchase; a word which, in its legal meaning, carried a much greater latitude than was understood (and that, perhaps, happily) in its ordinary acceptation; for it applied to all legal property acquired by any other means than that of descent.

"These, he said, were the objects of the proposed repeal. Some of the laws, he remarked, had now ceased to be necessary, and others were, at all times, a disgrace to humanity. The imprisonment of a popish priest for life, for officiating in the service of his religion, was horrible in its nature, and must to an Englishman be worse than death. Such a law, in

times of so great liberality as the present, and when so little was to be apprehended from these people, called loudly for repeal; and he begged to remind the house, that even then they would not be left at liberty to exercise their functions; but would still, under the restriction of former laws, be liable to a year's imprisonment and to the punishment of a heavy fine. And although, he observed, the mildness of government had hitherto softened the rigour of the law in practice, it was to be remembered that the Roman Catholic priests constantly lay at the mercy of the basest and most abandoned of mankind, common informers; for, on the evidence of any of these wretches, the magisterial and judicial powers were, of necessity, bound to enforce all the shameful penalties of the act. Others of these penalties held out the most powerful temptations for the commission of acts of depravity at the very thought of which our nature recoils with horror. They seem calculated to loosen all the bands of society; to dissolve all civil, moral, and religious obligations and duties; to poison the sources of domestic felicity; and to annihilate every principle of honour. The encouragement given to children to lay their hands upon the estates of their parents, and the restriction which debars any man from the honest acquisition of property, need, said he, only to be mentioned to excite the utmost indignation of the house."

The motion was received with universal approbation, and the bill already mentioned was accordingly brought in and passed. The following are the comments upon the new bill which were made by one who was both a contemporary witness and an able lawyer:—

"The legal operation of the act of the eighteenth year of his present majesty was very limited. It repealed the clause of the tenth and twelfth of William III., which disabled the English Catholics from taking lands by descent; and some clauses in the same act which related to the apprehending of

bishops and priests, and which subjected them and Catholics who kept schools to perpetual imprisonment. The other clauses of the act of King William, and every pain, penalty, and disability inflicted by other acts, remained in all their force against them."*

A similar act of relief was likewise granted to the Irish Catholics, and, two years afterwards, to the Scotch. It is not to be supposed that all classes of Protestants rejoiced in these concessions. Many, on the contrary, imagined themselves aggrieved, and, by all the arts of pamphleteering and placarding, endeavoured to arouse the national prejudices, and procure a repeal of the bill.

The agitation was increased by the exhortations of John Wesley. This founder of the Methodists might have learned, from the misrepresentations and hardships which he himself had suffered, to sympathize with others. Instead, however, of showing any such feeling, he hounded on, not only by words but by his writings, the already excited multitude. He published "a Letter concerning the Principles of Roman Catholics," imputing to them the old calumnies,—that they laughed at the obligation of an oath if administered by heretics, and that they believed that sins, not only past and present, but future sins, were forgiven in confession. From these unproved and false premises he drew the inference that no government "ought to tolerate men of the Roman Catholic persuasion" (Jan. 12, 1780).†

Soon after appeared the same writer's "Defence of the Protestant Association," another treatise of similar tendency. In this pamphlet Wesley fully identifies himself with the association, describing its views, and

* Butler's Hist. Mem. vol. ii. pp. 78—81.

† In support of his assertions, he quoted the Council of Constance, but gave at the same time no page, chapter, or session. To enable students to appreciate aright the knowledge and reasoning of Wesley and Father O'Leary, who answered him, the editors of the latter's works have judiciously printed together, the Letter and Defence of the former and the replies of the latter: no contrast could be greater. —See O'Leary's Tracts, pp. 192 and 215.

laying open its reasons, as only an influential member, not to say a founder, could.*

The "field-preachers" of the new sect followed their leader's example, pouring out every kind of vituperation upon the heads of the devoted Catholics. They particularly delighted in stating, in the most incorrect and reckless manner, the opinion regarding the Pope's deposing power; and this opinion, thus distorted, they did not hesitate to tell their credulous hearers was an article of Catholic faith. No less did they delight to repeat in every form, as another article of faith, the often-refuted calumny, that Catholics hold that faith is not to be kept with heretics. Their theme of themes, however, was to quote, and amplify, and colour, to their heart's content, the choicest morsels of Fox's so-called Book of Martyrs.

When the agitators perceived that by the bill of 1778, not only were Catholics better treated, but that the informers' trade was gone, the violence of their invectives redoubled. They trembled, they said, at the "alarming appearance of Popery in the present day;" Popery, which, "in past times, deluged our land with blood." They trembled too, they said, at "popish ignorance, which has deluded and destroyed its tens of thousands." The bill must be repealed. There is no safety if the Catholics are free; they must, therefore, again put on their chains.†

Thus aroused and excited, a variety of societies had sprung into existence maintaining and extending the agitation; but all were speedily merged in the Protestant Association. The meetings of this association were held "in every part of the town." The papers were filled with inflammatory paragraphs, in which neither king nor parliament was spared; being ac-

* See it in O'Leary's Tracts, p. 197. It is surprising how little Southey and the other biographers of Wesley have to say upon this passage of his life. It is despatched by the former in one line.—Southey's Life of Wesley, vol. ii. p. 389, 3rd ed.

† Barn.'s Challoner, p. 162. See "Strictures" on the "State and Behaviour of the Eng. Cath." London, 1782.

cused of a leaning to Popery, and of having passed an act for the overthrow of the Protestant religion. What was the use of the oath, it was demanded, when no oath could bind the consciences of Papists? It was of little use for Catholics to point out that, if this were true, they might have escaped all their sufferings during the last two hundred years: the agitation was too vehement to listen to reason.

The English Catholics saw the gathering storm, and in silent prayer sought to avert it. The Irish Catholics likewise observed it, and probably anticipated another Oates's plot, as well as their share along with their English brethren in another series of outrages and mock trials. They not only, however, prayed and kept their souls in patience, but one amongst them, Arthur O'Leary, the celebrated Capuchin, whose writings had already attracted attention, resolved not to allow Wesley's pamphlets to remain unanswered. This was a resolution requiring no little courage. The man who, in those days, entered into public controversy, was the very quarry looked for by the hawk-eyed informers. Even in Ireland, where the bulk of the people clung to their religion to the last, there appear to be only two or three instances during the previous part of the century of priests who were actually in the country daring with impunity to return a public answer to the calumnies of Protestant writers. In England, such a writer would be obliged, like Challoner when he had answered Middleton, to flee the country.*

O'Leary, however, had won some regard from government, by his conduct to English prisoners of war in France, as well as by his "Address" to the Irish, exhorting them in the very crisis of the American war, to remain firm in their loyalty. With this knowledge, and with the consciousness of his own powers as a writer, he drew up his "Remarks" upon Wesley's exposition of Catholic principles. It should

* See England's Life of O'Leary, p. 22, note; and Milner's Inquiry, p. 17, note 2, 2nd ed.

be read to be appreciated. The contemporary, and afterwards well-known, Milner, when referring to this overwhelming reply, and speaking of Wesley, thus eulogizes this opponent:—"How little does this head of a great party, and chief author of the riots of 1780, appear, when opposed to the deep learning, the sound logic, and the sterling wit of an O'Leary!"

Poor Lord George Gordon and his associates felt so aggrieved by the Remarks, that his lordship assured the House of Commons that they contained proof of an intended massacre of the Protestants. To support this assertion, he had the imprudence to read various extracts, which shook the house with laughter, and effectually proved his lordship's folly. *

This very folly, however, whether madness or wickedness, was now rapidly combining every element of mischief.

He finally called upon every Protestant who valued his religion, his liberty, and his country, to make his appearance in St. George's Fields, and to accompany the petition against the Catholics to the parliament-house.

A great multitude, variously estimated at from sixty to one hundred thousand men, obeyed the summons. Their badges were blue ribbons and blue cockades; and their cry, which they forced all passengers to repeat, was "No Popery." They arranged themselves in several bodies, six abreast. They then moved over the various bridges, the main body crossing London Bridge, with a man in front bearing on his head the petition, and preceded by another man blowing the bagpipes.

This vast tumultuous assemblage surrounded the houses of parliament, blocking up every avenue, and even penetrating into the lobby.

Their petition was then presented to the Commons, and was immediately read. It complained that the act for the relief of Catholics was passed and signed

* England's Life of O'Leary, p. 81, and passim; and Inquiry, note to p. 19, 2nd ed.

"before the sense of the nation at large could be obtained;" "that the Papists construe the late indulgence of parliament to be a toleration of Popery, as appears by the Mass-houses and schools which they are opening throughout the kingdom, and by their printing popish books, and publicly exposing them to sale; and that popish bishops, priests, Jesuits, and schoolmasters now openly exercise their functions, whereby the people, especially the rising generation, are in danger of being led into superstition, idolatry, and rebellion." "The petitioners do not desire to persecute the Papists, but to preserve themselves and their posterity from a repetition of those rebellious and bloody scenes which Popery, under pretence of promoting the interest of the Church, has exhibited in these kingdoms: wherefore, to preserve the succession of the illustrious house of *Hanover*, in the Protestant line, and to secure our civil and religious liberties against the encroachments of Popery to the latest posterity, the petitioners humbly pray, that leave may be given to bring in a bill to repeal the act lately passed in favour of the Papists."

The petition, after going through many usual forms, was rejected (June 20); but the passions of the mob, meantime, had become ungovernable.*

Insults offered to the members of parliament, and repeated assaults upon the doors of the house, were but the prelude to riots which left the capital for nearly a week in the hands of a drunken mob. The Catholic chapels, and the houses of Catholics, as well as those of their Protestant advocates, were plundered and burnt. Even the public buildings were at last assailed, and some were reduced to ashes. When the soldiers were at length let loose upon the rioters, and had effectually divided them, by occupying the three bridges, the mob, except in the brief but sanguinary struggles at the Bank, was too frantic either to fight

* See the royal proclamations of the 5th, 7th, and 9th June, and the subsequent proceedings of the Commons, as inserted in their Journals, pp. 901, 903, &c., and 913.

or to provide for its safety. Assailed in one part of the town, they broke up, and reappeared in another. Beneath the glare of six-and-thirty different conflagrations the work of riot and plunder still continued. Not till five or perhaps seven hundred wretches had fallen beneath shot or bayonet did this unprecedented riot subside (1780).

During the confusion, some of the Catholics displayed unshaken courage. Others, on the contrary, yielded to the terrors of the moment: "It is better," the latter class exclaimed, "to confess we are guilty of all the crimes laid to our charge, than to be burnt in our houses." They accordingly drew up a hasty petition, and were beginning to collect signatures when the danger ceased.*

When tranquillity had been perfectly re-established, several persons, both Catholics and Protestants, died from the shock. It is not, therefore, surprising that Dr. Challoner, now approaching his ninetieth year, should sink, when the crisis had passed, beneath the effects of his pastoral solicitude. For many years he had been continually afflicted by the prosecutions of informers, by the closing of chapels, and by the scattering both of priest and people. The sight of the ruined chapels, although the law would now rebuild them, seems to have given the last blow to his long-emaciated frame. A stroke of the palsy, followed in two days by another, broke from around him the chains of the flesh, and delivered him from a world of which he had always had a Christian dread (Jan. 12, 1781). †

The discourse at his funeral was assigned to Milner. Amongst other passages in which he delineated the life of the departed bishop, he thus referred to his

* Ann. Reg. in Butl. Hist. Mem. vol. ii. pp. 86—98; Sir Sam. Romilly's Diary; and Wraxall's Mem. i. p. 334, &c. 2nd ed.; State and Behaviour of Eng. Catholics, Preface, p. vii. London, 1780. This last work, although written by a Catholic, has a spirit and tendency anything but praiseworthy. For some details of the riots, see Appendix I.

† Barn.'s Life of Chall. pp. 242—250.

assiduity in the discharge of his office, as well as in the publication of his excellent works: —

"If it were not known how assiduous he ever was in the discharge of his sacred functions, and how much of his time was constantly taken up with preaching, instructing, administering the sacraments, attending to the various and intricate concerns of his district, and with his prayers and devotions, we might be led to imagine that he had done nothing else but write, and that his whole life had been devoted to the composition of the numerous works he has left us in defence of the true faith and of sound morality." *

"This zealous prelate," continues Milner, in another part of his discourse, "had a particular veneration for St. Vincent of Paul, and always celebrated his festival, which occurs the 19th July, with singular devotion. He read his life regularly every year, and still found fresh matter for his admiration and devotion in each perusal. He would sometimes attempt to read passages in the life of this great servant of God to those about him, but his feelings were sure to overpower him on those occasions, and his voice was soon suppressed in a flood of tears." †

* Funeral Discourse, p. 13. † Ib. p. 8, note.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

RELAXATION OF FERVOUR—SOME INSTANCES OF APOSTACY—CAUSES OF THEIR FALL—MISERABLE DEATH OF BILLINGE—THE "COMMITTEE"—ITS EARLY TENDENCIES—ERRORS OF JOSEPH BERINGTON AND DR. GEDDES—PITT'S QUESTIONS TO THE UNIVERSITIES—THE "DECLARATION AND PROTESTATION"—THE "PROTESTATION OATH"—"PROTESTING CATHOLIC DISSENTERS"—THE "ENCYCLICAL LETTER," AND CONDEMNATION OF THE OATH—WILKS AND REEVES—THE "BLUE-BOOK CONTROVERSY"—PILLING, MILNER, AND CHARLES PLOWDEN—THE COMMITTEE'S ATTEMPT TO ELECT A BISHOP FOR THE LONDON DISTRICT—A SECOND ENCYCLICAL—SINGULAR PROTEST—THE COMMITTEE'S RELIEF BILL PASSED; BUT THEIR NEW DESIGNATION TORN TO SHREDS BY PARLIAMENT—THE COMMITTEE BECOMES THE "CISALPINE CLUB"—THE MEDIATORS—THE STAFFORDSHIRE CLERGY—DEATH OF DR. BERINGTON.

The terrors of 1780 left a strong impression upon the minds of the Catholics. They were less persecuted, but they dreaded another outbreak. Both feelings, their fears and their enjoyment of comparative liberty, made them turn their eyes more than ever to the protection of the government. Some amongst them seemed to forget that the hearts of princes are in the hands of God; and instead of abandoning their cause, when they had done their duty, to Providence, they strove to secure by affected liberality the smiles and patronage of Protestants, and especially of men in power. There was not only a marked difference in the frequenting of the sacraments, but a change in the tone of many towards Protestantism. The desire to please those at whose mercy the worldly-minded among Catholics felt themselves to be, made them speak well not of Protestants (that would have been only ordinary charity), but of the worship of Protestants, as if it had ceased to be false; as if it were something towards which they might (as some actually

did) offer their contributions. Several chaplains flattered their patrons in this uncatholic spirit; not perceiving that both they and their patrons were gliding slowly, but surely, towards the gulf either of heresy or of religious indifference.*

The development of this worldly tendency was marked by the fall of nine or ten peers, whose apostacy purchased an entrance into the House of Lords. Several baronets fell at the same time. Several priests too went over to the well-endowed Establishment. The antecedents of the last-mentioned were such, that their fall and subsequent marriage excited no surprise.

Billinge, the chaplain at Mosely, and Wharton, who was serving the mission at Worcester, were skilful musicians: applauded for their performances, they both became fond of company, and both fell. Hawkins lost his faith in the same manner. "The rigid discipline of Rome," says Joseph Berington, in his own peculiar style, "could have little chance with such antagonists as love and music."† Billinge, on the last Sunday on which he said Mass, told his people at Mosely, that if they saw anything strange, they should remember what he had taught them, but not follow his example. They understood the meaning of this when they heard that on the next Sunday he had publicly apostatized. He afterwards married, and at last held the living of Wombourn. He became noted for being an habitual and public drunkard. He used often to pause by the rails of Sedgley Park bounds, and look at the sports of the boys, thinking, poor wretch, very likely, on his own happy boyhood, when he was a child of the true faith.

The boys, however, knew something of his history,

* Miln. Sup. Mem. pp. 44, 46.

† Sup. Mem. p. 8; Ber.'s "Reflections addressed to Hawkins," p. 8 (1785). Wharton was solidly refuted by the Rev. Wm. Pilling ("Caveat," London, 1785). Hawkins's endeavour to defend himself in the person of his fellow-apostate, Wharton, drew down Ber.'s Reflections as an answer to his "Appeal."

and used to salute him accordingly. He died in Wolverhampton. When Mrs. Billinge was mourning over his departure, she told Mrs. Jones, a neighbour, that she could not think how it was that her husband (Billinge) had died so miserably, but that in his last moments he had behaved "like a demoniac."* Such was the death-bed of this unhappy priest.

Where degeneracy did not thus ripen into apostacy, it took a form in many ways reprehensible. Of this, the history of the "Committee" is a sad but striking instance. In May, 1783, five laymen assembled, and, in a written document, stated themselves to be "the Committee appointed to manage the public affairs of the Catholics in this kingdom."†

One of the objects of this committee was nothing less than to procure a change in the government of the Catholic Church in England: to have bishops in ordinary, instead of vicars apostolic. Its avowed motive was, "that the frequent recurrence to Rome for dispensations, and other ecclesiastical matters, might cease." Four years later, when it had been remodelled, it gave other reasons equally unsatisfactory (A.D. 1787). "We beg leave to observe," were its words in a printed circular, "that the ecclesiastical government by vicars apostolic is by no means essential to our religion, and that it is not only contrary to the primitive practice of the Church, but is in direct opposition to the Statute of Præmunire and Provisors"! ‡

The allusion to the primitive, in opposition to present discipline, is the usual badge of schism. It virtually denies that the Church of Christ on earth is always the living body of the faithful under their living head, the successor of St. Peter. This denial

* So Dr. Bowdon, of Sedgley Park, and other credible contemporaries.

† MS. Mem. p. 45.

‡ Miln. Sup. Mem. pp. 47—49. From a chapter on the riots of 1780, Charles Butler passes rather abruptly to a chapter on the formation of the committee of 1787 (Hist. Mem. vol. ii. p. 100).

seems, indeed, something more than virtual, when the climax of its reasons for so important an ecclesiastical change, is merely a series of human enactments, to say nothing of their being intended both to cramp the liberty of the Church, and to impede, in purely spiritual matters, the pastoral care of the Holy See.

The year before these last reasons, such as they were, were produced (A.D. 1786), the committee, outstepping its proper limits in its zeal to enlighten Protestants, laid for signature before the Catholic public, both lay and clerical, what Dr. James Talbot, the vicar apostolic of the London district, not unreasonably denominated, a "doctrinal test." "If such a test is necessary," remarked that bishop in a letter to his brother, Dr. Thomas Talbot, of the Midland district, "they should have told us why, and asked the thing of us, instead of choosing for us." "Some there are who want to put us (bishops) in leading-strings, and themselves to hold them." The prelate then speaks (the words are Dr. Milner's) "of the sentiments of Bishop Matthew Gibson (of the North), as agreeing with his own. He then mentions certain changes proposed to be made in the ritual, on which he sarcastically remarks: 'But sure we (bishops) forget ourselves, or we should have applied to the committee, who have just as much business with rituals as they have with doctrinal tests and scriptures.' The doctrinal test here spoken of is the ever-varying exposition of Catholic principles, with reference to God and the country, which the Rev. Joseph Berington had, a little before, republished, though with great alterations, from a collection of old anonymous tracts, in his 'Reflections addressed to the Rev. J. Hawkins.'* Had it not been for the

* It may at first sight appear, from what are called the numerous editions of the "Principles," that they were greatly prized. The truth, however, is, that they occupy very few pages, and have therefore been attached to various pamphlets. It is their appearance in these pamphlets that is termed a *new edition*. Such editions, of course, are no test of the general feeling of the Catholic public.—See Dr. Kirke's Principles, pp. 20—50. The doctor's facts should,

decided opposition of the above-named and other bishops, one of whom was the learned Scotch bishop Dr. Hay, whose letter on the subject is preserved, there can be no doubt but that this faulty exposition would have been chosen by the lay theologians of the committee, instead of what is called the protestation, as the test of Catholic religious and civil principles." *

Joseph Berington was one of the few priests who seem from the very first to have sanctioned and assisted the committee. Even whilst at college he had been noted for his love of novelty and of the affected liberality of the day. If we may believe his warm but conscientious opponent, the Rev. Charles Plowden, he had, for the strong manifestation of such a spirit, been removed from his chair as professor.† Of him,

however, be separately weighed, as he appears from time to time to make deductions not strictly warranted.

* Miln. Sup. Mem. p. 51, &c.

† The Catholic receives his faith in baptism, and, thus prepared, receives the teachings of the Church, and firmly holds them, as a docile child does the words of its mother. If, as he grows up, his intellect be cultivated, he sees, not with surprise, but certainly with consolation, how perfectly consonant to reason, as far as it can grope its way, are the teachings of the Church. Berington, however, speaks of something apparently different from this process of the Catholic mind, something which had never been known until philosophy taught it: if so, his expressions are rash at the least, and he must be regarded as the true forerunner of the "Protesting Catholic Dissenters." The expressions referred to are the following:—"There is not a single article of my creed which I have not examined with that free discussion that philosophy has taught me to adopt. Having done this, you must allow me, at least, to be a rational Catholic."—("Reflections addressed to Hawkins," p. 22.) If such a declaration be allowed for to the utmost, and so interpreted in a Catholic sense, what palliation can be admitted for the following?—The Church, according to this writer, is like the Whig theory of the English constitution; and (can it be credited?) has derived its power, not from Christ, but from the people! "The *representative* body [the italics are Berington's] are our prelates; the represented are the people." The poor Pope is only "the first ecclesiastical magistrate"! He "has, indeed, his prerogative: but we have our privileges, and are independent on him, excepting where it has pleased the community, for the sake of unity and good order, to surrender into his hands a limited superintendence"!—("Reflections," p. 69.) These and

when upon the mission, Dr. Milner thus writes:—"One of them published as follows,—'Many things in the Catholic belief weigh rather heavy on my mind, and I should be glad to have a freer field to range in;' and being invited to preach at the meeting-house of Socinian dissenters, he excused himself on the sole grounds of the novelty 'of the proposal, and that his complying with it would give offence to the society of which he is a member;' adding, 'I would not willingly shock the prejudices of others, unless by that shock I might reasonably hope to surmount them. The temper of the times likewise must be weighed, lest by precipitance we rather check than encourage that happy tendency to benevolent and generous sentiments which rapidly advances among those of my persuasion. We differ, it is true, in points to which men, I think, have given an undue weight.' The chief of these, it is to be observed, are the doctrines of the Blessed Trinity and the Divinity of Jesus Christ. Another priest,* and he protected and pensioned by the leading Catholics, set at open defiance not only the doctrine and authority of the Catholic Church, but also the fundamental maxim of all Christians respecting the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, which, at the same time, he undertook to translate and to mend. The sequel of the present work will furnish too many proofs of the continuation of this worldly spirit in several Catholics; but particularly in their secretary and director,† with some of his lay associates and clergymen." ‡

such-like assertions were floating loosely, but widely, in the popular literature diffused upon the continent by Jansenists and so-called philosophers; and the very year after Berington published his "Reflections," they were collected into one body in the Synod of Pistoja (A.D. 1786). In 1794, no fewer than eighty-five propositions, taken from the acts and decrees of this synod, were condemned by the Holy See.—(See Bull of Pius VI.) The second and third of these propositions are condemned as heretical, and are, almost word for word, the same as Berington's assertion regarding the source of ecclesiastical power.—See the two propositions in Appendix K.

* Dr. Geddes. † Charles Butler.

‡ Miln. Sup. Mem. p. 45, &c.

Such was the origin, the nature, and the occasional tone of this but too famous committee. It was, in some respects, a useful institution, working zealously for the supposed interests of the Catholic body. Its zeal, unfortunately, was not according to knowledge. It sought to win emancipation by making to Protestants every concession that it believed it could in conscience, but it forgot meantime that minute theological knowledge would be necessary for so delicate a task; or rather it forgot that it was, unintentionally perhaps, but not the less certainly, usurping the place of the bishops and of the Holy See. Worse than all, its most trusted advisers were men of the stamp of Berington and Geddes.

It was now in treaty with the government for fresh measures of relief. It complained that the Catholics were not allowed their own "mode of worship;" were punished severely for educating their children "in their own religious principles," whether at home or abroad; could not practise any of the professions of the law, or serve in the army or navy, or vote in the elections, or hold a seat in either house; and it prayed William Pitt, who was now prime minister, to aid them in their intended application for redress.

The reply was satisfactory: all that Pitt required was an answer from several Catholic universities to the three following questions. Has the Pope, or any body or individual in "the Church of Rome," any civil power whatever in England? Can the same dispense with the oath of allegiance "upon any pretext whatsoever?" "Is there any principle in the tenets of the Catholic faith by which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics?" The committee sent these questions to the Sorbonne, to Louvain, Douay, Alcalé, and Salamanca, and laid before Pitt the answers. They were all explicitly in the negative.*

Whilst thus negotiating with government, the com-

* Butl. Hist. Mem. vol. ii. pp. 99—110, and App. to vol. i.

mittee was actively preparing its "intended application." It found its progress impeded by the Catholics themselves. They looked with apathy, if not distrust, upon a committee which was exclusively a body of laymen, and one of the leading members of which had declared, that "if any clergymen were admitted into it, he would withdraw himself."

It was found necessary to remove this impression. Three clergymen were therefore chosen by the committee to sit amongst its members as "representatives of the clergy" (May 15, 1788). These were "the Right Rev. Coadjutor Bishop Charles Berington, and the Rev. Joseph Wilks, men who had gone along with them in all their past measures; to whom they added the Right Rev. Bishop James Talbot, because," says Milner, "they could not pass him by, and hoped to hoodwink him." Dr. Talbot himself acceded to the nomination only, as he himself assured Dr. Milner, for the "purpose of restraining the others," against whom "he had prepared a formal protest." *

The preparations for the "intended application" to government were now rapidly progressing. An instrument, called a "Declaration and Protestation," was laid before the Catholic body for signature. The very name excited surprise and comment. Explanations were therefore made, and agents for procuring subscriptions were busily employed. The result was, that although "a certain number," as Father Charles Plowden tells us, "absolutely refused to subscribe it," yet the greater part of both clergy and laity were satisfied with the explanation, and with the assurance that no new oath would be added, and accordingly attached their signatures.

The document thus questioned, and thus finally accepted, had an origin generally unknown and very singular. The Dissenters were at this time asserting their right to a "complete toleration." Anxious to gather in every element of strength, they spoke of

* Miln. Sup. Mem. pp. 52 and 53, and note.

Catholics with a sympathy strangely at variance with the general tenor of both their words and actions. Having published their own "rights," they called upon Catholics "to publish their creed."

This Lord Stanhope, a Protestant as he was, actually did for them, if we are to believe Charles Butler. Be this as it may, the instrument thus drawn up or retouched by Stanhope was submitted to the vicars apostolic, and, having received some amendments, was finally but yet reluctantly approved.*

The following are some of the chief points of the Protestation. "We are accused of holding as a principle of our religion," that excommunicated princes may be deposed or murdered by their subjects or others. Such a position, on the contrary, we detest as impious; and we solemnly declare that neither the Pope nor any ecclesiastical power whatever can absolve the subjects of this realm from their allegiance to his majesty George III. We declare, too, that we are not bound, as it is sometimes said we are, to take up arms at the command of the Pope for destroying the lives of "persons of a different persuasion from us, or for subverting the laws and liberties of the country; that no prelate, priest, or other ecclesiastic, has any authority directly or indirectly to interfere with its independence, or with the rights of its people; that no ecclesiastical power can "dispense with the obligations of any compact or oath whatsoever;" "that no sin whatever can be forgiven at the will of any pope or any priest," "but that a sincere sorrow for past sin, a firm resolution to avoid future guilt, and every possible atonement to God and the injured neighbour, are the previous and indispensable requisites to establish a well-founded expectation of forgiveness." We also reject and reprobate the charge of holding that no faith is to be kept with heretics, declaring that no breach of faith with either heretic or infidel can ever

* Compare Butl. Hist. Mem. vol. ii. p. 110, &c.; Miln. Sup. Mem. p. 54, &c.; and Rev. Charles Plowden's Consider. on the Modern Opin. of the Fallibility, &c. Preface, 1790.

be justified. "And we appeal to the justice and candour of our fellow-citizens, whether we, the English Catholics who thus solemnly disclaim" the above-mentioned "unchristian-like principles, ought to be put upon a level with any other men who may hold and profess those principles."

A copy of this "Declaration and Protestation" was laid before parliament by the committee. It was accompanied by a petition to be relieved from "certain penalties to which they lay daily exposed, on the pretence of doctrines which they had solemnly protested against." *

Now that the "intended application" had been made, the committee, before drawing up the intended

* See it in Butler's Hist. Mem. ii. p. 113, &c. Dr. Milner thus comments upon the Protestation:—"It would occupy too much time and paper to discuss all the errors and inaccuracies of this boasted instrument: but it seems proper to point out one or two of them, by way of a sample. One vulgar accusation against Catholics, which the Protestation disclaims, is that 'the Pope can dispense with the obligation of any compact or oath taken or entered into by a Catholic, and that, therefore, no oath of allegiance, or other oath, can bind us.' Now, in what manner is this accusation repelled in the Protestation? Instead of simply denying that the Pope can dispense with our oath of allegiance, or any other compact between man and man, which was all that the occasion required, and which no Catholic would have hesitated to swear, we were called upon in the words of the instrument to protest that 'neither the Pope, nor any prelate, nor any priest, &c., can absolve us, or any of us, from, or dispense with, the obligation of any compact or oath whatsoever.' This is protesting more than is strictly true; for the Pope and other prelates can dispense with the obligation of a rash oath which is merely of a religious nature (such as that of immoderate fasting or prayer); and every priest, as well as every other man, can dispense with a compact (such as that of giving him a sum of money) which is merely in his own favour. In vain, however, did we plead for a small alteration in the wording of this passage, in order to reconcile it with theological accuracy; again, in vain did we beg that the word *mere* might be prefixed to the word *will* in the proposition which denies that 'any sin whatever can be forgiven at the will of any priest,' barely to express that the consent of the priest to administer baptism, for example, is a condition for the forgiveness of original sin in infants. The patrons of the Protestation laughed at our arguments, and told us that we must either sign the denial of the charges against us as they stand in the Protestation, or sit down quiet under the imputation of them."—Sup. Mem. p. 56, &c.

relief bill, adopted a measure which destroyed the confidence of the Catholic public, and reduced its own dignity to that of a private club. It had promised that no new oath should follow, and yet, at the suggestion of some of its Protestant friends, it now drew up its too famous Protestation Oath (June, 1789). It endeavoured to soften its breach of promise by declaring that the oath contained nothing more than the Protestation itself, and that it was necessary in order to gratify their Protestant friends. If at first this oath were, indeed, only a more solemn form of the Protestation, it quickly changed: the term "impious," which was applied to the deposing doctrine, was altered in the new oath into the terms of James the First's oath, "heretical and damnable;"* and it was also declared, that no foreign prince or prelate hath, or ought to have, "any spiritual authority, power, or jurisdiction whatsoever, that can directly or indirectly affect or interfere with the independence, sovereignty, laws, or constitution of this kingdom, or with the civil or ecclesiastical government thereof, as by law established."

What astonished Catholics even more than such assertions was, that the bill of relief prepared by the committee, was to be available to those only who subscribed their names in a court of justice, in the following manner:—"I, A. B., do hereby declare myself to be a Protesting Catholic Dissenter"! As if to add a climax to everything else, one of the clauses of the bill thus prepared provides that no child of a "Protesting Catholic" should be educated a "Papist." It was in vain that the committee strove, in blue and red books (as the pamphlets were named from their covers), to reassure the disconcerted Catholics. They might be called by their enemies Papists or Roman Catholics, and many amongst them, more than half

* Butler's account of the alterations does not contain these words. They appeared, however, as Dr. Milner assures us, not only in the committee's first blue-book, but in Woodfall's Register and in the bill of relief. They were recalled by the committee two years afterwards.

accepted these terms, as conveying a real compliment; but to adopt such a term as "Protesting Catholic Dissenters," would be to acknowledge that they had issued, like the sects around them, from the church of England, and to barter the glorious name of Catholic for a persecutor's mercy. Their confidence in the committee was gone for ever.

The vicars apostolic were, meantime, corresponding together upon these singular proceedings. They at last assembled at Hammersmith, and wrote the following "encyclical letter" to all the faithful of the four districts:—

"We think it necessary to notify to you, that, having held a meeting on the 19th of October, 1789, after mature deliberation and previous discussions, we unanimously condemned the new form of an oath intended for the Catholics, published in Woodfall's Register, June 26, 1789, and declared it unlawful to be taken. We also declared that none of the faithful, clergy or laity, under our care, ought to take any oath, or subscribe to any new instrument, wherein the interests of religion are concerned, without the previous approbation of their respective bishops. These determinations we judged necessary to the promoting of your spiritual welfare, to fix an anchor for you to hold to, and to restore peace to your minds. To these determinations, therefore, we require your submission." (Oct. 21, 1789.)

This letter received the approbation of the bishops of Scotland and Ireland, and, what was of far greater consequence, of the Holy See.*

* Miln. Sup. Mem. pp. 58—67. See also the encyclical letter of January 19, 1791; and the oaths, &c., in first and second blue-books; and Fr. Plowden's remarks in his "Case Stated," p. 116, and passim, 1791; Butl. Hist. Mem. vol. ii. p. 119, &c. The Memoirs now become exceedingly meagre. The schismatical tendencies of some of the committee are passed over. The bill, one or two matters concerning the oath and Protestation, as well as the instructions to Dr. Hussey, are given in full; but no other event is given previous to the veto. Those who have read the pamphlets of the intermediate period, or the Supplementary Memoirs, must be indignant that one

The silent acquiescence that welcomed this pastoral was general, almost universal. There was, however, in the committee and its friends a deplorable obstinacy. In the western district, the encyclical letter was accompanied by a pastoral, in which the venerable Bishop Walmesley explained his reasons for condemning the oath. The Rev. Joseph Wilks, who was one of the committee, was then the chaplain at Bath. Forgetting the obedience which he had so often preached, Wilks not only refused to read either the encyclical or the pastoral, but spoke publicly against the condemnation of the oath. Being deaf to the expostulations of his own superiors (he was a Benedictine), and equally deaf to the personal application and remonstrances of his aged bishop, he was at last suspended. Another clergyman, the Rev. Joseph Reeves, one of the suppressed order of the Jesuits, dared, in the course of the year 1790, to term the expressions of the encyclical, "sallies of intemperate language;" which, to this man of guarded phraseology, "could not fail of being very painful"! *

In the same unsubmissive spirit the committee wrote their first blue-book, containing a letter to the four bishops, and an appeal from their decision to the people. However contrary this was to the spirit of the Catholic Church, it was quite conformable to the principle more or less openly announced by some of the members, that ecclesiastical jurisdiction came from the people, instead of coming from Christ.

Two of the vicars apostolic dying in 1790, the com-

so fair in words could be guilty of an omission so important, and evidently so deliberate.

* Miln.'s Sup. Mem. p. 66; a "Letter to the Staffordshire Clergy by those of the Western District," pp. 15—17; Reeves' "View of the Oath," 1790, p. 12. In this "View," Reeves was not ashamed to defend the term "Protesting Catholic Dissenter" (pp. 20 and 21). "This well-intentioned but feeble performance," says Dr. Oliver, "was severely but fairly handled by that acute theologian, the Rev. William Pilling, O.S.F."—(Collect.) We ought to thank God that poor Reeves lost his History of Jansenism. Wilks, it may be added, retired to a Benedictine house upon the continent, and there died in all the sentiments of a fervent penitent.

mittee strenuously exerted itself to impress upon both clergy and laity their own right to choose and appoint their bishops, and to procure their consecration at the hands of any other lawful bishop. The discipline regarding the choice of bishops has varied, like other points of discipline, according to circumstances; but discipline it still remains: it came from the Church, it is subject to the Church, and it can be withdrawn or altered only by the Church. To proclaim that the Church teaching or ruling is the laity, instead of the bishops and the Holy See, is to raise the standard of schism and presbyterianism. This, however, was done in several publications, and especially in the "Letters," "by a Layman." According to this writer's principles (he was one of the most eminent men on the committee), St. Augustine and his brother missionaries ought to be considered only as "foreign emissaries." For he dared to stigmatize the vicars apostolic as "foreign emissaries, who preside in virtue of an authority delegated by a foreign prelate, who has no pretensions to exercise such an act of power."

The writer forgot that the Church is one, not many, and that, therefore, the term foreign, as applied to ecclesiastical rule, has no meaning. Accustomed, moreover, to the principles of the English constitution, he had grown so narrow-minded as to think it the height of liberality to apply those principles, not to Holland or France (that would have been too absurd), but to the Church of God. No wonder the letters, impartial as they affect to be, and polished as they really are, teem with dangerous and erroneous conclusions. The author was a baronet; and his influence, no less than his plausible style, drew around him many followers. There was reason to dread an open schism.

The zeal of several of the clergy took fire at this outrageous contempt of authority, and in a variety of publications they exposed the hollowness of reasoning in these and other tracts. Foremost amongst these champions of the faith and the Holy See were Pilling, the Franciscan, the Rev. John Milner, then a mission-

ary at Winchester, and Rev. Charles Plowden, one of the then suppressed Jesuits, a man eminent for learning and practical ability.

The committee, meantime, finding that Dr. William Gibson and Dr. John Douglas had been duly appointed to the northern and southern (or London) districts, prepared to appeal to Rome. They had intended to procure Dr. Charles Berington to be vicar apostolic of the London district. Being thus disappointed, one member entreated Dr. Berington "to stand firmly" to what he was pleased to call "his election," whilst another, under the name of "a Protesting Catholic Dissenter," pledged himself to propose at the next Catholic meeting, that "No other person but Dr. Berington should be acknowledged as bishop of the London district;" and all, meantime, united in securing the services of Dr. Hussey, a chaplain at Spanish Place, and in drawing up instructions for his guidance at Rome. Three important points in these instructions are suppressed in Butler's printed copy.* Dr. Hussey was to claim, as the clergy's absolute right, the election of the bishops; he was to declare the two bishops already chosen "obnoxious and improper;" and he was to threaten to cut off pecuniary supplies to the missions. The intended appeal, however, was not attempted. Dr. Hussey's conscience smote him, and he declined to proceed further in the business. Dr. Berington, too, in a printed letter addressed to the clergy of London, resigned every pretension to be vicar apostolic of London, and entreated the other members of the committee to withdraw their opposition to Dr. Douglas † (Nov. 4, 1790).

The close of this eventful year saw the consecration of Dr. Douglas and Dr. Gibson in the chapel of Lulworth Castle. Before leaving the castle, the four

* Dr. Milner proves this by quoting from a MS. which had been "corrected" by Butler himself.—See note to Sup. Mem. p. 71.

† Sup. Mem. pp. 65—75; also "A Letter," &c. "by a Layman," passim; Rev. Ch. Plowden's "Observations" and "Considerations," 1790 and 1791.

bishops drew up and signed a new encyclical letter, renewing, "in the fullest manner," the condemnation of the oath, and the declaration that no oath ought to be taken, and no instrument regarding religion ought to be signed, without the approbation of the bishops. The encyclical then exhorted the Catholics, if the attempt to introduce the oath to parliament were continued, to present a counter-petition, "or to adopt whatever other legal and prudent measures may be judged best." It declared its disapproval of the term "Protesting Catholic Dissenters, given us in the bill," as well as of three of its provisoes, which were expressed in the former encyclical letter. It concluded with the following words: We hope "that you have rejected with detestation some late publications, and that you will beware of others which may appear hereafter. Of those that have been published, some are schismatical, scandalous, inflammatory, and insulting to the Supreme Head of the Church, the Vicar of Jesus Christ." *

Before publishing this letter, they made an attempt to lead back the committee, and especially Charles Butler, its secretary and manager, to more becoming sentiments. These efforts being fruitless, they published the encyclical letter (Jan. 19, 1791).

The committee immediately published a vehement "Protest," beginning:—"Therefore, my lord bishop of Rama, V.A. of the western district; my lord bishop of Acanthos, V.A. of the northern district; my lord bishop of Centuria, V.A. of the southern district;—your lordships having brought matters to this point:—convinced that we have not been misled by our clergy; convinced that we have not departed from the principles of our ancestors; convinced that we have not violated any article of Catholic faith or communion,—We, the Catholic committee," &c. Four times did this rather brief protest invoke God to witness it, and to witness its truth, whilst it was declaring that both

* Sup. Mem. App. B. p. 278.

the encyclical letters were, in "every clause, article, determination, matter, and thing therein respectively contained," "arbitrary and unjust;" full of "misrepresentation;" "encroaching on our natural, civil, and religious rights; inculcating principles hostile to society and government, and the constitution and laws of the British empire;" and "as derogatory from the allegiance we owe to the state, and the settlement of the crown." This violent declamation ended in words too usual in the career of schism: "We do hereby appeal" "to all the Catholic churches in the universe, and especially to the first of Catholic churches, the Apostolic See, rightly informed."

Well might Dr. Milner, when narrating this, exclaim: "Oh what tears of contrition, what explicit retractations, are not requisite to expiate so much guilt and scandal!" *

The Rev. John Milner, at this time still the priest at Winchester, and afterwards the chronicler of these unhappy occurrences, was selected by the bishops "to make what interest he could among members of parliament in favour of unity and orthodoxy." He was introduced in the first place by Burke to the leaders of the Commons. His observations produced a favourable impression. Smith, the head of the dissenting interest, after hearing his statement of the Catholic doctrine of an oath, promised his support.

The "day of trial," for the reading of the committee's bill of relief, now at length arrived. Milner, having left his friends in prayer (for human calculations were against them), went to hear the debate. He himself, intrusted with so important a work, had made a last effort. On his way from Winchester to London, he had drawn up a paper, entitled, "Facts relating to the Contest among the Roman Catholics." By means of an officer of the house, who was his friend, copies of this paper were distributed among the members.

Having thus discharged his commission, he took his

* Sup. Mem. pp. 74—76, &c.; App. C. p. 280.

place in the gallery to witness the result. He found himself amongst a crowd of exulting adversaries. Mitford presented the bill, passing a eulogium upon the "Protestant-Catholic Dissenters," and comparing them (a very dubious compliment) to the Remonstrants in the reign of Charles. Fox and Burke took up the strain in a very different manner, and with their usual glowing eloquence. Pitt was long and obscure, being as yet undecided. In this crisis of the bill, Sir Archibald Macdonald, the attorney-general, called attention to the "Facts," which he said proved that "one of the Catholic parties were as good subjects and as much entitled to favour as the other." Such a declaration from such a personage produced its effect. Pitt examined the paper, and exclaimed, "We have been deceived in the great outlines; and either the other party must be relieved or the bill not pass." *

Although nothing decisive was done, it was evident that the cause of the oath was in jeopardy. The secretary of the committee, therefore, publicly announced that Milner was not authorized by the Catholic body. Beaten from this position, he attempted to prove to the members of parliament that the supporters of the oath were the majority, by identifying the oath with the Protestation, and by alleging the numerous signatures of the latter as evidence of the support given to the former.

The result, however, in parliament, was the perfect discomfiture of the committee. The ministry struck out from their new title the term "dissenter;" and then the remainder, "protesting Catholic," was too glaringly inconsistent to be allowed to remain. Nor was this all: the oath was utterly discarded, and was replaced, at the suggestion of Dr. Douglas, by the Irish oath of 1778.†

* The relief afforded by the bill was to extend, it will be remembered, to those only who subscribed themselves "Protesting Catholic Dissenters."—See App. L.

† Miln. Sup. Mem. pp. 78—86; and App. D. p. 282.

The bill itself passed without a dissentient voice. It repealed the statutes of recusancy in favour of persons taking the oath; it repealed the oath of supremacy passed by William and Mary, as well as various declarations and disabilities; and it tolerated the schools and religious worship of Catholics. The double land-tax, moreover, was never again exacted* (June, 1791).

The nature and issue of this contest having been narrated, the numbers and influence of those who were more or less engaged in it, and the plea which charity will allege for men whose disobedience it cannot excuse, are thus summed up by an eye-witness, a Catholic conveyancer of the Middle Temple:—"I hope, as I have before said, that an idea will not be conceived by any one, that because we have thought that an oath which others were ready to take was not strictly conformable with the doctrine of our faith, therefore was that faith renounced or abandoned by those who thought the oath admissible. We all agreed in the doctrine, but differed as to the conformity of the oath with that doctrine. It is the duty of an historian to represent the persons whose actions he relates as truly and faithfully as the actions themselves. By far the greatest number of the English Roman Catholics of rank and fortune have throughout the whole of the business, sided with the committee; though some of that description have from the beginning disallowed their commission, others have remained totally inactive, and some few have latterly appeared in open opposition to their measures. On the other side, the four apostolical vicars, by far the greatest number of the Roman Catholic clergy, some persons of rank and fortune, and by far the greatest number of the middling and lower classes of the Roman Catholics, have been driven to the mortifying necessity of publicly opposing the measures of the

* Stat. 31 Geo. III. For the inaccurate account given by Butler of the vote of thanks at the Crown and Anchor, &c., see Sup. Mem. p. 87, &c.

committee; and their opposition, thanks (under God) to the liberality and wisdom of parliament, has been crowned with the most signal success."*

The committee continued its sessions and its opposition to authority for some months after the passing of the relief bill. When the five years, the term of its existence, were drawing to a close, it gave a signal proof of its perversity, by forming itself and a few of its partisans, "to the number of thirteen in all," into what it styled a "Cisalpine Club" (April 12, 1792). Its avowed object, says Dr. Milner, was to oppose the "usurpation of the Pope, and the tyranny of the vicars apostolic." Even Butler admits that "the fundamental principle of this club" was adherence to the Protestation Bill, and that its name was assumed "as a mark of their opposition" to certain "encroachments of the court of Rome on the civil authority."

A number of gentlemen, acting as "mediators," were now uniting their efforts to restore a general good understanding. The newly-formed club, however, would make no kind of submission. Wilks, the suspended priest of Bath, who had, in addition to other offences, signed, as one of the committee, the protest against the encyclical letter, must, they replied, be first restored to the exercise of faculties; satisfaction must be made for Plowden's being requested by three vicars apostolic to write the "Answer" to the second blue-book;† and the ecclesiastical government must be rectified, the missionaries becoming parish priests. To other similar attempts they made similar replies: "The protest we cannot recall while the encyclical letters remain unrecalled."‡ The club, therefore, continued its meetings for nearly thirty years.

The mediators being indignant at the unchristian

* Francis Plowden's Case Stated, 1791, p. 57.

† For the real value of the documents in the blue-books, see Sup. Mem. p. 94, note.

‡ Sup. Mem. pp. 97–100. But. Hist. Mem. vol. iv. App. pp. 476 and 477.

character of the club, organized in opposition to it the "Roman Catholic Meeting" (May 1, 1794). Bishop Douglas, four peers, four baronets, and about forty other gentlemen, were its first members. It continued for a very few years, and then broke up.

The blue-book controversy, meantime, continued unabated in the Midland district. It is, indeed, scarcely to be wondered at: Dr. Charles Berington, the coadjutor bishop of the diocese, an amiable and talented man, had yet so little firmness of character, that he was the passive instrument of the committee. As early as the time of Wilks's suspension, thirteen priests, too well known as the Staffordshire clergy, without a full knowledge of the circumstances, had published a defence of Wilks, and, interfering between him and his bishop, pledged themselves to make his cause "their own." Continuing this unhappy course, they fell, in their "Appeal to the English Catholics," into the inaccurate if not (in its obvious sense) heretical proposition, that the bishop of Rome was "supreme in spirituals by divine appointment; supreme in discipline by ecclesiastical institution." Perceiving the tendency of such writings, Bishop Walmesley commanded his clergy not to admit "to the exercise of any ecclesiastical function" any of those who signed the appeal, "until they have explicitly and publicly disavowed or withdrawn their signatures" (A.D. 1797).

At the request of those that had thus signed, the bishop explained what he considered to be the erroneous points (1798). The one already referred to was the only one distinctly mentioned as heretical: the others might be explained in two senses. In thus pointing out what was erroneous, the bishop seems to have been more than necessarily curt and severe. The priests, on the other hand, were too unbending: they scarcely admitted, although their friend and defender, the coadjutor bishop,* Dr. Charles Berington, ad-

* Dr. Thomas Talbot having died in 1795, Dr. Berington would, in the usual course of things, have received the powers of a vicar

mitted for them, that "the first proposition was inaccurately worded."

Finding that the vicar apostolic of the North, Dr. Gibson, had sent "a formula" to the same priests, to be signed by them as a test of their orthodoxy, Dr. Berington expressed his surprise: "It is really time that these things should have an end. I declare myself completely satisfied with the faith and moral conduct of the gentlemen in question" (May 9, 1798).

Not quite a month had passed after penning this letter, when Dr. Berington was suddenly called to give an account of his stewardship. Having dined at Sedgley Park, he had departed on horseback, in company with his secretary, Mr. Kirk. Before he could reach his house at Longbirch, he was seized with violent pain, and having dismounted, almost immediately breathed his last.*

apostolic. As, however, the Holy See was not satisfied with Dr. Berington's conduct, and as Dr. Berington hesitated to give it the satisfaction required, his sudden death came upon him before his receiving the appointment.

* See the letters, &c. in "A Short and Plain Statement of Facts," 1798. Dr. Berington's departure from "the Park," and the news of his almost immediate death, are still remembered by those who were then in the Park bounds.

CHAPTER XXIX.

DR. STAPLETON AND DR. MILNER SUCCESSIVE VICARS APOSTOLIC OF THE MIDLAND DISTRICT—CONTRAST BETWEEN DR. MILNER AND DR. POYNTER, THE COADJUTOR OF DR. DOUGLAS—IMMIGRATION OF FRENCH CLERGY—BLANCHARDISM—DECLARATION OF THE IRISH BISHOPS IN THE CASE OF TREVAUX—THE VETO QUESTION—ITS ORIGIN AND NATURE—MILNER HESITATES AND THEN INFLEXIBLY OPPOSES IT—DEFEAT AND VEXATION OF THE ADVOCATES OF THE VETO—PREPARATIONS FOR A NEW BILL—ATTEMPTS TO ENSNARE DR. MILNER—THE FIFTH-RESOLUTION MEETING AT ST. ALBAN'S TAVERN.

THE "thirteen" Staffordshire priests continued, more or less, the same course after, as before, Dr. Berington's death (Nov. 7, 1800). On the appointment of Dr. Gregory Stapleton to be vicar apostolic, perfect harmony was re-established. His death was the signal for another dissension. Some of the Cisalpine Club renewed the appeal to clergy and people which they had made before the appointment of Dr. Douglas. It is no wonder that Dr. Milner, who was now selected for the Midland district, should feel reluctant to face the restless spirit that to a stranger seemed to animate the whole centre of the district. Seeing his reluctance, his friends, and particularly Sharrock, the prior of the Benedictines at Acton Burnell, and brother of Dr. William Sharrock, the coadjutor bishop, cautioned him that it was his duty, for the sake of unity, to accept the onerous task. He therefore at last acceded. He was consecrated at St. Peter's Chapel, Winchester (May, 1803).

Within a few days, Dr. Poynter was consecrated as coadjutor bishop of the southern or London district, Dr. Milner preaching on the occasion. These two prelates were both destined by Providence to rule for more than twenty years their respective dioceses. Their

characters and manners were very dissimilar. In polish, and perhaps in theological learning, Dr. Poynter was greatly superior to Dr. Milner. The latter, however, had a keener insight, a more ample grasp of mind, and, in short, a soul of stronger texture, though of ruder outline. He was a warrior too eager for the battle to care even sufficiently for the minor graces of social courtesy. Such a character was at that time greatly needed. If the work of the Church be earnestly, faithfully discharged, some amount of precipitancy, the result of zeal aroused and provoked by crafty blandishments, may well be overlooked.

As Dr. Poynter's consecration was attended by all the vicars apostolic and by many priests, advantage was taken to hold a kind of synodal meeting. After various topics had been introduced and decided with perfect unanimity, it was resolved that "the chief practical difficulties under which the Catholic religion labours in England from the present state of the laws," are, that Catholic soldiers and sailors "are still debarred the exercise of our religion;" that "Catholic marriages, though publicly performed in licensed chapels, are not valid in law;" and that, "though Catholic chapels and schools are licensed by law, yet the property for their support is subject to confiscation."*

Keenly indeed must the bishops have felt the uncertainty alluded to in the last resolution; for it regarded not merely the general question of education, but the vital question of either a supply or an almost total deficiency of priests for the mission. The English college at Rome had been dispersed by the

* Sup. Mem. pp. 108—111. The fact of Catholic property being thus liable was made the pretext for retaining, as it has been again and again asserted, and apparently never denied, a large sum of money, which, at the close of the war with Napoleon I., the French government had paid to the English ministry as restitution-money to the Catholic colleges. The money has been again and again demanded in parliament, but without success. And with this fact staring them in the face, the English government pretends to be in earnest in forwarding universal education!

French. The seminary of Douay, too, that monument of the zeal and abilities of Cardinal Allen, had been seized by the French revolutionary government, and its superiors and students had been scattered or imprisoned. The latter institution, it is true, was not annihilated; but its offshoots, the schools which sprang up at Crook Hall near Durham, and elsewhere, were struggling with almost insuperable difficulties; and this it was that elicited from the bishops, who were anxiously watching their progress, the above expression of their sympathy and grief. Nor was it a barren expression: it was owing to the active concurrence and strenuous exertions of the vicars apostolic that, in a very few years, the schools expanded into something more worthy of diocesan seminaries (A.D. 1808), and the colleges of St. Cuthbert's, St. Edmund's, and St. Mary's, although bereft of the advantage possessed by their mother-house, of being an integral part of a university, and although in great measure isolated and shut up within themselves, yet were enabled to afford a large supply to the missions, and all but reached the deserved reputation of old Douay, both in general literature and in more solid acquirements. They have well served the necessities of a time of transition. God grant them the means and the self-denying energetic spirit to raise themselves yet higher, that, at any cost to themselves individually, they may do the great work that is before them, and, with eyes open to watch and repair every deficiency, may cease not until, in brotherly co-operation, they take that lead which the institutions of the Catholic Church ought to take of every other seat of education and learning.*

The English Benedictine houses in France shared the misfortunes of the secular college; and thus

* If there are any who question the prudence of some assertions in the "Rambler" regarding our college education, there is assuredly no one who is zealous for the Church, and therefore necessarily a true friend of all the colleges, who can withhold his warm thanks to the writer of the articles alluded to.

English priests, both religious and others, shared in the terrors and hardships of the same revolutionary prison. Acton Burnell afforded shelter for more than twenty years to the Benedictines. There they recast their shattered establishments, and finally transferred them to Downside and Ampleforth.

Whilst the bishops were as yet in their first consternation at the loss of nearly all their seminaries, the French revolution, which had caused the calamity, was destined, in God's mercy, to be the very means of making some compensation. Its violence compelled a great number of French clergy to take refuge in England, thus rendering a most timely and ample supply for the various missions.*

The tide of exiled clergy was, indeed, far beyond all the need of the missions: it soon amounted to no fewer than eight thousand. It was accompanied by a vast number of the French nobility; and nearly all, both nobles and clergy, were cast penniless upon the shores of England. Seldom or never has England presented so noble a spectacle as on that occasion. It rose superior to its old prejudices, and received them all with open arms: one thousand of them found a shelter in the king's house at Winchester, and the voluntary subscriptions that poured in being still insufficient, a large sum was annually voted by government for many years.

In the fearful state to which, meantime, the Church in France had been reduced, the Pope found it necessary to apply a remedy proportioned to the greatness of the evil. He treated with Napoleon, divided France into new dioceses, and requested the banished prelates to resign their former sees; intimating that, if they chose to return to France, they would be appointed over others (Aug. 1801).

* Although, in the Catholic periodicals of the last thirty years, ample confirmation of the overthrow of our seminaries may be found, it seems unnecessary to quote them: are there not numbers of us who have heard it again and again from the lips of those who were directly engaged in them?

The greatest part at once acquiesced. Others, whilst expressing their respect for the Holy See, seemed to think it impossible to separate the interests of religion from the dynasty of the Bourbons, and therefore addressed an "Expostulation" to his Holiness, and withheld their resignations. The bishops who had resigned immediately returned to France, and multitudes of priests accompanied them. Of the French clergy in England, nine parts out of ten thus returned. Of those that remained, a considerable part were animated by an excessive loyalty to their exiled princes. In an enthusiastic desire to uphold the despised claims of the Bourbons, they forgot the higher claims of multitudes of perishing souls, and the right and duty of the Holy See to provide a remedy for extreme emergencies. These men, who, from their leader Blanchard, became known as Blanchardists, not only exclaimed against the new ecclesiastical arrangements in France, but refused to acknowledge the Church in France, thus reconstituted, to be any part of the Catholic Church. They even dared to censure the Pope as guilty of schism. For seven years, declamations of this kind resounded in the French pulpits in London.*

Dr. Milner and two of the French priests published works which ought to have enlightened them; but so far were they from listening, that they added one rash assertion to another. Pius VII., they did not hesitate to say, "had violated the canons of the general councils," and had formed a church on grounds which Pius VI. had condemned "as impious, heretical, and schismatical."

Dr. Milner upon this issued a pastoral to his clergy, condemning such assertions as schismatical, and for-

* Barruel; Artaud's Hist. du Pape Pie VII. tom. i. c. xi. xiv. xxx. xxxvi.; Sup. Mem. p. 107, &c.; and Dr. Milner's Pastoral Charge, parts ii. and iii. The Third Part is "private." The friends of Blanchard, as Dr. Milner himself assures us, denounced the bishop as an enemy to the king; no trifling imputation in those days upon any Catholic, much less upon such a one as Dr. Milner.—Past. Charge, part iii. pp. 6 and 7.

bidding any one who advocated them, to be allowed to receive or administer any sacrament (A.D. 1808). The persons thus condemned appealed to the Irish bishops, but were told in reply that they had no right to make the appeal, and that the propositions of Blanchard were "false, calumnious, scandalous, and schismatical" (July 3, 1809). In the following year, the four vicars apostolic, with their two coadjutor prelates, assembled by appointment, and agreed that any French priest who refused to acknowledge that "Pius VII. is not a heretic or a schismatic, or the author or abettor of heresy or schism," should not be allowed to hold spiritual faculties, or to say mass, in any of the four districts.

This test was immediately applied in the Midland district, but not at once in that of London, a discrepancy which produced some confusion. Amongst those that had publicly advocated the condemned assertions was Trevaux. He was therefore suspended; but on making a verbal apology to the vicar apostolic, and declaring to him that he was ignorant of his disapprobation of Blanchard's book, he was permitted to resume his functions and hold spiritual faculties. This being done without any retractation publicly made or privately acknowledged, it caused much grief to Catholics, and was held up by Blanchard as a proof of his own veracity and orthodoxy.

To obviate in some degree so great a scandal, the four archbishops of Ireland, with three other bishops, passed a resolution, that "by the readmission of Trevaux to the sacred ministry in the London district, schism is openly countenanced there, to the great injury of religion and Catholic unity, though contrary to the intentions of the vicar apostolic." *

Whilst Dr. Milner was thus struggling with Blanchardism, he had to contend at the same time with a very different enemy. The spirit which had given birth to the Protestation oath and the Cisalpine Club,

* Sup. Mem. pp. 177—185, and App. G. p. 300; and Synod. Lett. to Di Pietro, &c. See Appendix M.

after slumbering for a few years, was now giving fresh proofs of an active existence. Its object was still to obtain the abrogation of the penal laws, but unfortunately this abrogation was to be won by the concession of a thing which was not the committee's own, either to hold or give, of a portion both of the discipline and liberty of the Church. The committee or club, when it had become the Catholic Board, took upon itself to offer to the crown the right to refuse, or, as it was called, to exercise a veto in, the election of the Catholic bishops. Such a right might in theory be made exceedingly limited, but in the hands of the royal ministers it would in practice increase, and, it is to be feared, would be speedily attended with all the evils that preceded the Reformation.

The first proposal to yield such a power to the crown did not emanate directly from the committee, but from the government (1799). Pitt was anxious to secure the Union. He wished not only to create one imperial parliament, but even, by obtaining a veto over the election of Catholic bishops, to unite in some degree the crown and the Catholic hierarchy. This idea, if we may believe some Irish contemporaries, arose from the acts of the "Protesting Catholic Dissenters." This may have been so, but it is scarcely worth while to prove it: interference with the freedom of ecclesiastical election, whether called a *veto* or a *congé d'élire*, whether legalized or assailed either by craft or violence, has ever been the first object of the enemies of the Church. If a bishop elect be really a traitor, there are laws to punish him. In other cases, he has a right to that maxim of British law, which pronounces a man innocent until he is proved guilty. The very request for a veto is therefore unnecessary: it is a threatened violation of personal liberty, and a badge of persecution and servitude.

Pitt's proposal, accompanied with a promise of a suitable provision to all the Catholic clergy, was made to ten Irish bishops, who were trustees for Maynooth College. It was made, it should be observed, in a

time of unusual terror. The rebellion of 1798 had just been crushed, and exulting Orangemen were pillaging, torturing, slaying, almost at discretion. The ten bishops, influenced undoubtedly by the scenes around them, listened with deference to the minister's proposal. Yet they made no actual surrender of principle. They signified their acquiescence if the provision offered were "competent and secured;" if the government restricted its interference to an inquiry into their loyalty; and if the transaction were ratified by the Holy See.*

For eight years the proposal seemed forgotten. It was, indeed, relinquished by Pitt, but it was eagerly caught up by his political opponents. They saw what influence they would have, could they induce the bishops to accept emancipation at such a price. For years they had struggled in vain for pension and place. To win this object by Pitt's rejected scheme would be a double triumph. Such was the object, and such the intended means, of these ambitious and narrow-minded statesmen.

The details of the means by which they sought to achieve this purpose were worthy of the times, and are deserving even here of a moment's notice. The Catholic laity were to be first of all reinstated in some of their political rights, not merely out of good will, but that they might not suspect the real object of ministers, and then the clergy were to be pensioned, "that they might be better disposed," as Lord Grenville himself stated, "to the support of the established government"—of course, meaning by government, himself and his friends, when they had beaten down the Tories. "For," he continues, "if they alone had accepted this favour, leaving to the body of the laity the feeling of having been sacrificed by their clergy for the sake of temporal emolument, it is easy to see they

* See their resolutions in Wyse's Sketch of the Catholic Assoc. App. No. 6; Madden's Un. Ir. passim; and Wyse's Sketch, book i. note to p. 166.

must lose all influence over their people."* Their influence was thus to be respected, guarded, and fostered, for the political purposes of the Whigs (A.D. 1801).

The latter had, undoubtedly, some patriotism in this, but it was the patriotism of short-sighted partisans. They wished to bind Ireland more closely to England, to the supposed advantage of both, and particularly of the latter, and in such a union to establish, not the general prosperity, but the political supremacy of the Whigs.

Their joy revealed their insidious intentions. The Catholics became alarmed and more watchful. They were preparing a petition for relief, and especially for obtaining the redress of the grievances pointed out at the consecration of Dr. Poynter; and the Whigs were everywhere their smiling friends. Still they were occasionally startled by the singular expressions of their Protestant allies. The session for the petition opened, and now such expressions were undisguised, and continually recurring.

The king, it was said, was now, virtually at least, head of the Catholic Church in Ireland: papal influence was at an end. This language was openly used, not only by the press but in the parliamentary debates. The Catholics have determined, said Mr. Ponsonby, "to make their superior clergy subject to the Crown." For this he quoted Dr. Milner himself. The latter had, indeed, for the moment, advocated a very moderate kind of veto; but seeing how statesmen interpreted even such a concession, he saw the perilous nature of the whole question, and became the uncompromising opponent of any kind of veto. The Irish prelates had appointed Dr. Milner as their representative and agent in this important business. They were astonished at the language of the debates and at the apathy of their English brethren. They were

* See Grenville's letter to the marquis of Buckingham, in "Memoirs of the Court and Cabinets of George III.," by the duke of Buckingham and Chandos.

satisfied, indeed, with Dr. Milner's explanation of his own conduct, but they thought it high time to express their own united sentiments. In September, therefore, all the Catholic bishops of Ireland assembled. Many amongst them now heard for the first time of Pitt's proposal in 1799. All expressed regret that it was entertained, and declaring that they always had, and always would, recommend for the episcopacy loyal and peaceable men, they unanimously decreed that "it was not expedient that there should be any alteration." *

Great was the vexation of the Whigs; and in the eyes of such Catholics as judged the world, not according to its own shifting standard of expediency, but by their own sincerity, this vexation appeared to be the natural result of a genuine liberality of soul thwarted unexpectedly in its disinterested efforts. While some Catholics lamented, as much from sympathy with their supposed friends as from the failure itself, Grenville thus vented his wrath against the far-seeing men who had frustrated his deceitful purpose. "They have marred their own cause, but that of the country may be wrapped up in it, and if I could unite Ireland in heart and affection with England, I should not care one farthing (comparatively speaking) how such blockheads as Milner and his colleagues were, or were not, appointed. Influence, it is clear, they have hardly any now, and in that case they would have none." †

When the first passionate emotion had thus exhausted itself, Grenville and his Whig allies adopted another plan of operations. Their former object, indeed, was still paramount; but it was to be achieved

* Synod. Letter of the Irish bishops to Card. di Pietro, in Appendix (G) to Sup. Mem. (Nov. 12, 1813); Dr. Poynter's Apologet. Ep. to Card. Litta, in Butl. Hist. Mem. vol. iv. p. 435; Wyse, Hist. Sketch, vol. i. p. 166, note; and vol. ii. App. 6, 7, and 8; Sup. Mem. p. 128; Plowden's Ireland since the Union; Grenville's Speech in 1810, &c. &c.

† Letter in the Memoirs of the Court and Cabinets of George III. by the duke of Buckingham.

by neutralizing or eluding the opposition of the Irish prelates. Could the Whigs, by artful management, pass a bill for their purpose, the prelates themselves would be at their mercy.

The tortuous, underhanded arrangements that followed, are but half discovered, and would scarcely repay a close examination. They come to light sufficiently in the known acts of the Catholic Board, and in the subsequent but abortive bill of relief.*

Under the influence of some of the members of the old committee, a literary club had been organized, for the purpose, so it stated, of answering the multitude of anti-Catholic tracts (A.D. 1807). As no such answer did appear, it might be inferred that its real purpose was something very different. The inference would have been justified by the events of a very few years. Scarcely a twelvemonth after its completion the club was transformed into "a select board," one object of which was to organize an association for "the general advantage" of the Catholic body (May, 1808). Several years elapsed before this organization was completed.†

It became known, meantime, that a new bill of relief was in preparation; and to the more observant, it was suspected that there were to be some remarkable but carefully-concealed additions. This suspicion grew into certainty on the appearance of a letter from the earl of Grenville to Lord Fingall, who was then standing aloof from the Irish bishops. The earl stated, that with the concession of civil rights to Catholics "must be combined other extensive and complicated arrangements" (Jan. 25, 1810). Arrangements "other" than civil must be religious. Indeed, this is admitted by the subsequent portion of the earl's letter: it was the

* "Hoc decretum graviter tulerunt quidam viri politici, tam Catholici quam Protestantes, in Anglia; unde, ut illud retunderent, quamdam propositionem artificiosam et dolosam, quæ Quinta Resolutio vocatur, excogitabant," &c.—Synod. Letter to Card. di Pietro, Miln. Sup. Mem. App. G, p. 297.

† Sup. Mem. pp. 135 and 136; and Ch. Butl. Hist. Mem. ii. p. 202.

"proposal of vesting in the Crown an effectual negative on the appointment of your bishops." *

Soon after the date of this ominous letter, Charles Butler, who, along with other Catholic gentlemen, had just been, and still for some time continued, in treaty with the Earls Grey and Grenville, proposed to a few of his friends, as "perfectly reasonable and free from objection," the following resolution, which was to be afterwards proposed to a general meeting of Catholics: "The Catholics are ready to enter into any arrangement, consistent with their faith and discipline, which may be required of them for securing the loyalty of persons to be raised to the rank or office of bishops."

From all accompanying circumstances, it was quite evident that Butler's words, however general, referred to the proposal about which Grenville had written to Lord Fingall. Indeed, it was afterwards admitted by Dr. Poynter, that the resolution was drawn up by Lord Grey himself. As it was strongly opposed by one of the company, a gentleman who was then acting as secretary to the Board, and who was pledged to the Irish to resist every kind of veto, and as Dr. Douglas, on being consulted, instantly rejected it, various terms were omitted, and the whole resolution was recast; but amongst the vague expressions still employed and now adopted, was a passage, copied word for word from Grenville's letter.†

Both before and immediately after this proposition was submitted to the Catholics, several attempts were made either to surprise Dr. Milner, or to overawe, or even, with shame be it said, to browbeat him, into acquiescence. Intending to be present at the coming meeting, Dr. Milner had but just arrived in town, when he was invited to what he understood to be a mere friendly dinner-party. It was at Doran's Hotel, in Dover Street. Several Catholic gentlemen, and

* See the passage in Sup. Mem. p. 142.

† Compare Sup. Mem. p. 135, &c.; and Dr. Poynter's Apologetical Epistle to Card. Litta, in Hist. Mem. App. p. 436, &c.; and Dr. Milner's Remarks upon the Epist. ("Addit. Notes," p. 339, &c.)

amongst them two peers, were present; but not one of the clergy. No sooner was the cloth removed and the servants gone, than the resolutions intended for the next day's meeting were read aloud, and several voices exclaimed, "Dr. Milner, will you sign these resolutions?" Recovering with some effort his presence of mind, he replied that he could not sign the "fifth" and last. A long debate followed; questions, objections, and remarks, were poured upon him unsparingly for a whole hour, until his nerves, but not his resolution, gave way, and he burst into tears. This so far softened the company, that one of the peers, who occupied the chair, took him by the hand and told him he forgave him his opposition. Others still pressed him, at least, not to influence his fellow-bishops. He replied that "he would use such arguments as his conscience dictated." It was also at this time, probably, that a fact of a similar character occurred at Stowe, the seat of the duke of Buckingham. The bishop was induced to pay the duke a visit. The latter was not alone: he had assembled a party of the leading Whigs. It soon became painfully evident to the bishop, that the whole tendency of their flattering attentions and conversation was to disarm his opposition. The scheme developed, at last, into close argument. Standing at bay among men accustomed to all the craft of modern politics, the poor bishop's heart more than once sunk within him. He rallied, however, and held on until after midnight, when the party broke up. His thanksgiving, after such a trial and escape, we may easily imagine. He at once, however, resolved to break loose altogether from the snare. At the earliest dawn, he threw his portmanteau over his shoulders, and groped about the mansion until he found his way to the servants' offices. Some noise directed him to an open door, where a woodman was discharging his load. Issuing forth and striding over the "dewy lawn," the uncompromising bishop sang the "In Exitu Israel," in the joy of his heart.*

* Sup. Mem. p. 147, &c.; and Addit. Notes, p. 341. The scene

Other trials, scarcely less afflicting, were now at hand. The day for Lord Grey's modified proposition having arrived, two hundred of the Catholic gentry and clergy assembled in one of the rooms of St. Alban's Tavern. Dr. Milner, Dr. Poynter, and Dr. Collingridge, the vicar apostolic of the West, were the only bishops present. As Dr. Milner entered the room, whispers loud enough to be distinctly heard went round the place: "Not a word of the veto,—no one must so much as mention the veto." When the real business, the proposition, better known as the "fifth resolution," was introduced, the three bishops all, at first, withheld their assent; intending, according to agreement, to discuss the question in a synodal meeting. Whilst, however, Dr. Milner was in a distant part of the room, several gentlemen endeavoured to shake the determination of the other prelates. One of them even added, apparently by some mistake, that Dr. Milner had said that he would offer no opposition as vicar apostolic, but merely as the agent of the Irish bishops. This was entirely incorrect; but under the circumstances it had great weight; for during the various speeches, one submissive expression had greatly moved both Dr. Poynter and Dr. Collingridge. Dr. Poynter, with too great a condescension, had, as he himself states, "proposed for consideration," what indeed the meeting had nothing to do with, and what the prelates had already resolved upon, "whether it were not expedient that the vicars apostolic should abstain from signing till the arrival of Dr. Gibson?" I added (continues Dr. Poynter himself), that "the concert of all the four vicars apostolic, if they were of one opinion, would add strength to the resolution, and greatly assist to the obtaining of that which all had in view." To these observations Lord Stourton replied, amongst other things, that "if any specific conditions which pertained to matters of religion

at Stowe, the Right Rev. Monsignore Weedall heard from the bishop's own lips. I have also heard it repeatedly from others who are now no more.

should at any time be proposed, they should be submitted to the judgment of the vicars apostolic." This sentiment was received, as it deserved, with great applause. The two bishops hailed its reception as the harbinger of greater harmony, and began to think it their duty to meet half-way an expression so Catholic, and of late years, amongst some Catholics, so unusual. If such a feeling were indeed a weakness, it was yet one of the most excusable. They forgot, however, that similar promises appear in the blue-books and other writings of the old committee, and that, in fact, the well-intended words of Lord Stourton had no meaning. The fifth resolution, as soon as signed, was to be laid before parliament, along with the bill of relief. It would no longer depend upon his lordship, or the Catholic body, to submit anything to the vicars apostolic: this could be done only by government or the parliament. A solid reason in reply, it certainly was not. Yet, vague as it was, and although the vicars apostolic could, if it were desirable, meet the wishes of the meeting on the very next day, and thus with greater dignity meet half-way the good feelings of the laity, the two bishops were now so complaisant as not even to pause until they had learned the truth from Dr. Milner's own lips. They believed what was said; they assented to the resolution; they subscribed their names. Dr. Gibson, the vicar apostolic of the North, and his coadjutor, about a fortnight afterwards, added their names likewise to the resolution.

Great was the triumph of those that were in the secret of the resolution; and one of their leaders could not refrain from acknowledging that they had "jockeyed" the bishops.*

A petition embodying this resolution, and being preparatory to a relief bill, was presented, in about three weeks, to the House of Lords. Lord Grey's

* Compare Sup. Mem. 142, 160; the printed letter of Dr. Poynter and Dr. Collingridge to Dr. Milner, Feb. 14, 1810; and Dr. Poynter's Apol. Epist. to Card. Litta, in Hist. Mem. vol. iv. App. pp. 435—445; and Addit. Notes, pp. 345 and 349.

speech on this occasion left no room to doubt that the vague terms of the resolution had, in the intentions of the Whigs, a definite meaning. "I am content," said Grey, alluding to Grenville's letter to Lord Fingall, "to refer myself to the excellent letter of my noble friend, to every letter, principle, and word of which I beg to be considered as implicitly subscribing."

In the House of Commons, the petition was presented by Mr. Wyndham (1810). Some portions of the speech which he made on that occasion with reference to the Catholic gentry, are worthy of being remembered as an uncontradicted and unbiassed testimony. "When I speak of their obscurity, I do not mean that they are destitute of hereditary virtues and hereditary dignity; that they are not a part of that class which ought to be denominated 'ultimi Romanorum.' I cannot contemplate a more noble and affecting spectacle than an ancient Roman Catholic gentleman in the midst of his people, exercising the virtues of beneficence, humanity, and hospitality. If they are obscure, it is because they are proscribed as aliens to the state; because they are shut out from this assembly, where many of those who are far less worthy are allowed to sit. Have they ever tried those vile arts which are exercised so successfully by those many to creep into pension and place? Have they ever attempted to obtain their rights either by clamour or by servility? On the contrary, their conduct has proved that no other body is more justly entitled to respect and admiration." *

* See printed extract from the *Globe* of February 22, 1810.

CHAPTER XXX.

THE IRISH PRELATES THANK DR. MILNER FOR HIS FIRMNESS—MISSION OF DR. MOYLAN—THE SYNODAL MEETING AT DURHAM—THE TRIPLE DECLARATION—BILL OF 1813—ITS LONG OATH—THE CATHOLIC BIBLE SOCIETY—DR. MILNER AND ARCHER'S SERMONS.

When the Irish prelates heard of the acceptance of the "Fifth Resolution," they immediately held a synod in Dublin. Fifteen were present, and all the other twelve sent their proxies. The result of their deliberations was a repudiation of lay interference; a condemnation of the resolution as too indefinite, and as binding Catholics to accept future statutes which might be injurious to the integrity and security of ecclesiastical discipline; and a vote of thanks to the firmness of Dr. Milner, "for his apostolic constancy in withstanding the said resolution." The indignation of the great mass of the Irish people surpassed even that of their bishops. The English Catholics had pledged themselves "to adopt no measures affecting the general interest of the two bodies without the concurrence of their Roman Catholic brethren in Ireland." Yet the "Fifth Resolution" had passed despite of them. No wonder, then, that in every part of Ireland the universal exclamation was, "We are betrayed by the English Catholics." *

Being thus at some issue with a few English bishops upon the "Fifth Resolution," and with those of the London district upon Trevaux's case, the twenty-seven Irish prelates knew that they had discharged but half their duty by this exercise of zeal: they now sought, while still maintaining truth, to win their

* Sup. Mem. 160, 168; and App. G for Syn. Letter of the Irish Bishops, p. 297; Butl. Hist. Mem. ii. p. 193.

English brethren to peace. They deputed Dr. Moylan, the bishop of Cork, to visit, on this errand of charity, all the English bishops. Dr. Moylan was well adapted for so delicate and important a mission: he was not only firm, but so amiable in his manner that he was called the "St. Francis of Sales of modern times." His efforts were but partially successful. He was, indeed, everywhere kindly received. After a brief stay in the west, he hastened to London. He had instructions to see with his own eyes the written retractation of Trevaux. This, however, he found did not exist: a document referred to by Dr. Poynter was nothing more than a personal apology. Leaving London and calling on Dr. Milner, he went to the north, and induced the bishops to hold a synodal meeting at Durham. Their meeting was, of course, concealed from public notice. A few years previously, Dr. Lingard had dared to reply to Shute, the bishop of Durham; and his adversaries, stung by his cool sarcasm and solid argument, threatened a prosecution. The time had not yet come for openly and yet unobtrusively transacting the business of the Catholic Church in England. The bishops, therefore, although their gaze must have been continually arrested by the majestic cathedral built for them and theirs, were yet well content with an ordinary house, and a very modest apartment.

Dr. Poynter, and his vicar general Mr. Bramston, Dr. Milner, Dr. Gibson, and several others, there assembled to confer with Dr. Moylan and his companion Dean Macarthy. To smoothen matters to the utmost, Dr. Milner made an ample apology for any of his expressions which might have given offence, "not meaning, however, to retract any fact or reasoning."

The only tangible result of the meeting was a unanimous threefold declaration. On the one hand, they promised to be vigilant in preventing, and firm in resisting, any innovations or measures prejudicial to the unity or authority of the Catholic Church, to the sacred rights of the Apostolic See, or to the integrity

or security of our holy religion, in its faith, morality, or discipline. On the other hand, they all condemned the undutiful expressions of Blanchard's followers, and all appeared to be equally unanimous in rejecting the veto, but not in repudiating the "Fifth Resolution." Thus terminated the mission of Dr. Moylan.

The predictions of Dr. Milner and the Irish prelates, regarding this much-debated point, were soon proved to be too well grounded.*

The opening of the following year was marked by the preparations for presenting the relief bill. It was generally understood long before, that the Whigs would bring forward such a measure, and yet would so manage that it should not be too closely "sifted." Mr. Percival (a little before he received his death-wound) had thus addressed the House:—"They tell us that they have a project, but that they will not bring it forward, for fear of its being sifted. What, do they then intend to carry their bill through parliament in a single night?"

Now, at last, their plan of operations was developed, and a deep-laid stratagem, indeed, it proved. A greater one, however, than Solomon or Sampson was watching over his defenceless little flock in England; and the meshes of the hunters, when just encompassing their prey, were torn in pieces. The bill passed in safety the ordeal of the second reading, but most unexpectedly was thrown out in the third.

It was proposed by Grattan (April 30, 1813). The

* Sup. Mem. pp. 185, 190; and App. E, p. 290. What a commentary upon all these proceedings is the Prince Regent's letter to Sir George Provost, the governor of Canada. That letter actually commanded Sir George to forbid, "under very severe penalties," "all appeals to, or correspondence with, any foreign ecclesiastical jurisdiction;" and all exercise of "episcopal or vicarial powers," "without a license;" and this, "to the end that our just supremacy in all matters, ecclesiastical as well as civil, may have its due scope and influence" (Carlton House, Oct. 22, 1811).—See extract in the Appendix to Father Plowden's "Second Historical Letter to Sir John Hippesley," App. No. III.

account of its nature and progress is thus narrated by Dr. Milner:—"On the last day of April, Mr. Grattan presented to the House of Commons, and thereby to the view of the Catholic as well as the Protestant public, the long-expected bill, that is to say, the pleasing side of it, that of emancipation. On the same occasion Mr. Canning gave notice, as had been settled, of his intention to move for certain clauses or restrictions to be added to it, without mentioning anything more of their nature than that they were "perfectly conformable to the spirit of it." These proved to consist chiefly of the presbyterian plan of subjugating the bishops, and through them the whole business of the Catholic religion, to the control of the leading men of that communion, being the same which he had been concerting for months beforehand with the theological lawyer of Lincoln's Inn. In conclusion, Lord Castlereagh produced a different set of clauses, which gave the ministry the power of an effectual veto over the whole. Altogether, the bill fairly printed forms a considerable volume. It contains four or five different sets of galling restrictions, so as to constitute it a bill of pains and penalties rather than that of relief, and it enjoins no fewer than six new oaths, adapted to the purposes of the restrictions. From the circumstances and terms of its forerunner, the Fifth Resolution, there was reason to fear that the bill of relief, as it was termed, would turn out to be a bill of persecution; but no Catholic alarmist ever conceived it would be of so oppressive a nature as it proved to be.

"The first striking feature in the bill is the long Theological Oath, appointed to be taken by all persons who were to derive any advantage from the bill, and also by 'every person now exercising, or who shall hereafter exercise, any of the spiritual duties or functions usually exercised by persons in holy orders professing the Catholic religion;' which oath is three times the length of the odious declaration called the Long Oath; besides a profession of civil allegiance, it contains alleged tenets of the Catholic faith on ten

different articles, all of them more or less inaccurately, and some of them erroneously, expressed."

"This long oath is immediately followed in the bill by another of considerable length, framed exclusively for the Catholic clergy, by which they would have been precluded from corresponding with all foreign prelates in every part of the world, on subjects of literature, health, civility, &c., as well as on professional business. This oath was to be taken by them within six months from the passing of the act, under the penalties of a misdemeanour for neglecting to take it, but without any, the least, benefit to themselves from complying with it." *

"The last clause of this cumbrous bill, though aimed at the Catholic bishops and clergy, strikes at the freedom of every British subject. It requires, that, 'As often as any subject shall receive any instrument from the See of Rome, or from any person or body in foreign parts, acting under the authority of the said see, or under that of any other spiritual superior, that they shall deliver the same in the original to the President of the Board,' namely, the Secretary of State, who, though he be its absolute head, is not to judge of its contents by his own lights and information, but must send it them to judge whether there is anything in it 'injurious to the safety of the kingdom, or to the Protestant establishment.' Any contravention of this clause by the party receiving the instrument, or by any other person, subjects them to be sent out of the kingdom, that is, to be transported." †

"Notwithstanding the powerful support of the bill by members of the Cabinet, as well as by the opposition, and notwithstanding the expedition of its managers in hurrying it on after its contents became known, in order to prevent its being sifted; yet resisted, and even sifted, it was, during the three or four days of its lying complete before the House of Commons.

* Miln. Sup. Mem. p. 195, &c. † Ib. p. 199, &c.

Dr. Duigenan, and the other professed enemies of emancipation, could not fail of opposing it with a virulence proportioned to its prospect of success; and Sir J. Hippesley made a separate attack of a tendency no less fatal to it than the former." *

"When the above-mentioned assembly of bishops and noble and honourable laymen broke up, the success of the bill, on its third reading, was as confidently anticipated to take place in the course of a few hours as the rising of the sun the next morning: but God was pleased to have mercy of the remnant of His holy religion in this kingdom." The bill was rejected.†

Whilst the fate of this measure was as yet uncertain, the opponents of emancipation raised a cry that the Catholics were enemies of the Bible. Instead of meeting this calumny with a straightforward explanation, and then with patience, the Catholic supporters of the veto bill established a "Catholic Bible Society." Finding that this measure had given no little scandal, they induced Dr. Poynter to become its president. Anomalous as such a position might appear, the good bishop seems to have accepted the office as the best means of checking the evil tendencies of such an association. An edition of the New Testament, with scarcely any notes, was the only result of much talk, and of many meetings of this incongruous association. A brief from the Holy See condemned it, in 1816, as "a crafty device for weakening the foundations of religion."

In the same unfortunate year as the veto bill and the Catholic Bible Society, there was laid by dissenters a twofold snare for Catholics. Catholic Bibles were printed with the omission of every note and explanation; and schools professedly Catholic were opened, and well supplied with clothes and food for the children, into which no priest was to enter, and in which no catechism, no kind of book, was allowed, but the Bible alone. That Charles Butler, whose

* Miln. Sup. Mem. p. 202. † Ib. p. 208, &c.

name has been so sadly prominent, should have had the direction of the Catholic Bible Society, scarcely excited surprise; but it was indeed to the "astonishment of the whole Catholic body" that his name now appeared in the newspapers as a subscriber to schools of so designing and heterodox a character. The schools, however, failed as signally as did the Catholic Bible Society, or as did the hideous title of Protesting Catholic Dissenter.*

No external conflict could draw away Dr. Milner's attention from the ever-varying stratagems of error. Whether the error regarded faith or morality, whether it arose from the craft of open enemies or the inadvertencies of Catholics themselves, his warning was sure to be speedily heard. He was, indeed, a watcher upon the walls of the Church, whose vigilant eye detected every movement of evil. Amongst other errors of which he thought proper to caution his flock, were some in the Faith of Catholics; and some in the "Sermons on various Moral and Religious Subjects for all the Sundays," &c. These sermons are Dr. Archer's. The bishop thus speaks of them: "As these, notwithstanding their general orthodoxy, in addition to their eloquence, contain a certain mixture of erroneous and dangerous morality, and frequently breathe a spirit very different from that of the holy fathers and the saints," &c.† The sermons particularly mentioned are those on "Humility," on "The Passions," and "The Means of Subduing the Passions." In fact, as some of these sermons were copied almost word for word from Blair, it is scarcely surprising that some of the Protestant leaven remained unperceived.

* Sup. Mem. pp. 239—245.

† See Dr. Milner's Past. Charge of March 30, 1813, part ii.

CHAPTER XXXI.

QUARANTOTTI'S RESCRIPT—DR. MILNER AND DR. POYNTER AT THE HOLY SEE—CARDINAL LITTA'S EPISTLE—PIUS VII. TO THE BISHOPS OF IRELAND—SIR JOHN HIPPESLEY'S COLLECTION—"RESOLUTIONS" OF THE VICARS APOSTOLIC — THE TEST OF BLANCHARDISM IN LONDON—THE NEW VETO BILL OF 1821—ITS FAILURE—DR. MILNER RESTRAINED BY THE HOLY SEE — HIS DEATH AND CHARACTER—THE FREE SOCIETY OF SECULAR CLERGY—DR. MILNER AND "THE STAFFORDSHIRE CLERGY."

BAFFLED in all its attempts, the committee or board now wished to procure from Rome a censure, not indeed upon its own unworthy actions, but upon those who had boldly maintained the rights of the Holy See. The Pope, Pius VII., was still in captivity, and the cardinals were scattered either in various prisons or in exile. Monsignore, afterwards Cardinal, Quarantotti, the secretary and vice-prefect of the Propaganda, was the only ecclesiastical dignitary left in Rome. To him the board despatched its agents, with an extremely inaccurate account both of the rejected bill and of Dr. Milner's conduct. Having received letters from Dr. Poynter on the one hand, and from the archbishop of Dublin on the other, Quarantotti, in a letter to Dr. Poynter, declared that Catholics might accept the bill, provided certain changes were made in the oath (Feb. 1814).*

By the opponents of Dr. Milner's views, this letter was hailed as a triumph. Scarcely, however, had it been issued, when Pius VII., so long Napoleon's

* Miln. Sup. Mem. pp. 217, 218, &c.; Hist. Mem. vol. ii. App. p. 467. Francis Plowden, the barrister, maintains that the rescript was both devised and "modelled in the British metropolis." His proofs, or rather collection of probabilities, are certainly remarkable. —See his "Second Historical Letter to Sir J. C. Hippesley," p. 55, and passim; Paris, 1815.

captive, was set at liberty. Amongst the numerous congratulations which were laid at the feet of his Holiness, were those of the English Catholics; in which they added an expression of thankfulness for Quarantotti's rescript. In his reply, the Pope informed them that with regard to the rescript, "which contained matters of the highest moment," he had submitted it, for a full examination, to the college of cardinals (Dec. 28, 1814).

For Dr. Milner was already pleading at the Holy See. He had passed through the allied camps, which covered the north and south of France and the north of Italy, and arriving in Rome only "a few days after" the return of his Holiness, speedily obtained an audience. The Pope received him with extraordinary kindness, and hastily exclaimed: "Has the act of parliament passed? Have the Catholics taken the oath?" He added that Monsignor Quarantotti "ought not to have written that letter without authority from the Holy See."

"There is no question, Holy Father," replied the vicar apostolic, "about an oath, or an act of parliament: the emancipation will take place, but not till there is a great change in his majesty's counsels. In the mean time, schismatical measures have been carried on among our Catholics, as I am prepared to prove to your cardinals."

He, accordingly, drew up a "memorial of the whole case," concluding with an offer to resign his dignity, if, in consequence of the many enemies, both Catholics and Protestants, whom "inflexibility in defending and securing our holy religion had provoked, or on any other account, the See Apostolic judge it to be for the advantage of religion."

When the memorial had been maturely examined, Dr. Milner was called to an official audience on the eve of the great festival of SS. Peter and Paul. He was informed that his general conduct was highly approved by the college of cardinals and the Pope himself; "that he had well defended his cause and

that of the Church, and this on its true ground;" and, finally, that "his resignation could not be accepted of."

On other occasions, he was repeatedly told that "he had done his duty, and ought to proceed in the track he had hitherto pursued." With the genuine simplicity of a noble spirit, Milner himself appends to all this approbation the only reproof which he had received, and which, together with a manly expression of sorrow and of readiness to make satisfaction to any injured party, he repeats in several parts of his writings. He was told that, whilst careful to pursue the same course, "this ought to be done with moderation, and without irritating the feelings of others."*

Whilst the first examinations of this important business were thus satisfactorily closing, and whilst Dr. Poynter, who was now in Rome, was awaiting the result of his Apologetical Epistle, or defence against some of Dr. Milner's charges, the clang of arms suddenly resounded upon the Mediterranean and the Apennines, and through all France, until it was as suddenly hushed upon the plains of Waterloo and the heights of Monmartres. Murat had marched upon the Pontifical states, and Napoleon had quitted the isle of Elba. Pius VII. had, therefore, taken refuge in Genoa, where he was protected by British troops and men-of-war. The mind of his Holiness was not easily discomposed: he continued to apply, as far as possible, to the general business of the Church, not forgetting his children in England. Dr. Poynter's Apologetical Epistle was now examined. It does not appear to have even modified the impression, that Dr. Milner pursued the right course, although rather too warmly. Dr. Poynter, indeed, was complimented as an excellent prelate; but this, with its accompaniment of a painfully cool reception, was scarcely so full an

* Sup. Mem. pp. 228—231; and Additional Notes, pp. 335 and 336. These additional notes were written at the end of 1820. But a short time before they were written Dr. Milner had received a letter from Cardinal Litta, bearing "clear testimony to the merits of his cause in general" (p. 335).

exculpation as he himself had requested. "We most earnestly urge by our entreaties," such were his words, "that such a sentence may be pronounced by the Holy See as will make it manifest to our respective flocks that we have performed, in their regard, all the duties of good shepherds, under the supreme shepherd, Christ our Lord, with the greatest care, and in everything."

At last, all preliminaries being completed, Cardinal Litta, the prefect of the Propaganda, addressed Dr. Poynter in a written document, in the name of his Holiness. It contained three forms of oaths, any of which the British government might select. It also stated that the Pope would allow those who had the appointment of the bishops to show the list of candidates to government, and to expunge the names of persons objected to, provided there were names enough left of highly qualified candidates for the selection of the Holy See. The cardinal added, however, in direct contradiction to Quarantotti, his subordinate, that the "royal exequatur," or inspection of rescripts from Rome, could not for a moment be tolerated: "it cannot even be made a subject of negotiation." It would be criminal to transmit to any lay power, "the free exercise of that supremacy of the Church which has been given in trust by God." If some even Catholic governments have assumed such an authority, it is only by an abuse of power, an abuse which "the Holy See, to prevent greater evils, is forced to bear and tolerate, but cannot by any means approve" (April 26, 1815).

Learning from the personal representations of two prelates, that had been sent to Rome by the Irish bishops, that there was great alarm in the Church in Ireland respecting any concession to an intriguing government, the Pope himself now addressed "the archbishops and bishops of Ireland." He pointed out to them the real nature of the projected concession. No right of nomination, presentation, or postulation, had been in any way bestowed. The rule of Benedict XIV.

declaring, in his letter to the bishop of Breslau (May 15, 1748), that the nomination to bishoprics or abbeys was never to be given to princes who were not Catholics, had not been sacrificed. All that was granted was "a certain power of exclusion." It were, indeed, to be wished, that in the election of bishops we enjoyed "that full and complete freedom which so peculiarly makes a part of our supremacy, and that no lay power had any share whatever in a matter of so much moment" (Feb. 1, 1816). When the Irish Board took upon itself to call the attention of Rome to the same subject, the Pope referred to his late decision, and commanded them to be satisfied (Feb. 21, 1818). Thus temperately and wisely, and with many cogent reasons, did his Holiness at once lull the apprehensions of the bishops, and terminate the perilous discussions and recriminations of the last thirty years.*

Whilst general harmony was thus gradually returning, it was again threatened, but, contrary to expectation, was at last confirmed, by several events resulting more or less from the rejected veto bill. Sir John Hippesley, once the great friend of the Catholic Board, had formed a notion that it would be useful to appoint a comptroller of the Catholic clergy and discipline. He, himself, it appeared, would have no objection to the office. When the bill failed, he collected, in nearly six hundred closely-printed folio pages, "all the Jansenistical and irreligious ordinances which had been extorted by deistical ministers and parliaments from unsuspecting Catholic sovereigns during the last century." This collection, he trusted, would induce the parliament to adopt his plan. He was disappointed, but continued for several years to repeat his demand for its examination. At length, to the great

* See the Var. Doc. as translated in Butl. Hist. Mem. ii. p. 467, App.; and vol. iv. pp. 486 and 469. Dr. Bramston's account of the reception at Rome, whither he had accompanied his bishop, Dr. Poynter, is still remembered by some of our oldest London missionaries.

alarm of the vicars apostolic, his motion was carried (A.D. 1817).

Dr. Milner, therefore, published "An Expostulation," showing that "the laws and practices of Catholic states are no proof of the doctrine or discipline of the Catholic Church, unless they are received or acknowledged by her;" and that to enact against the English Catholics the edicts of Joseph II., and other mistaken or unprincipled rulers, would be a real religious persecution. Whether it was the effect of this work or not may be problematical, but not so the result of Sir John's efforts—they terminated in failure and contempt.

Several resolutions drawn up in consequence of his first success, but never published, sufficiently prove that the four vicars apostolic, notwithstanding the "Fifth Resolution," were unanimous with regard to the "effectual negative" of the late discarded bill. The fourth and fifth of these resolutions were as follows:—"That, as official guardians of the Catholic Church, we deprecate the surrender of the nomination of Catholic bishops to a prince who is, by law, the head of a different religious establishment: nor can we assent to the interruption of the free intercourse in ecclesiastical matters, which must subsist between the chief bishop and the other bishops, subordinate pastors of the Roman Catholic Church. Fifthly, that in framing these resolutions, we have been actuated by an imperious sense of duty, and by the purest spirit of conciliation." *

In the following year, the only remaining point of difference was removed: the vicar apostolic of the London district commanded that all French priests who might apply either for spiritual faculties, or for leave to say Mass, should first subscribe to a test of

* Sup. Mem. p. 247, &c. Dr. Poynter had, five years before this, publicly expressed his anxiety "to preserve to the Catholic Church the free appointment of the ministers of religion," as well as his disapprobation of "anything which restricts a spiritual power superior to our own."—See his Pastoral of November 17, 1813.

Blanchardism, the same in substance as that which had been agreed upon eight years before by all the vicars apostolic (A.D. 1818).*

Scarcely had George IV. ascended the throne, when fresh petitions for relief were made, and two other emancipation bills were introduced. One of these bills contained a restriction upon correspondence with Rome, and a new, and what appeared to the Leinster prelates "an unlimited negative," on the appointment of the bishops, "a power, as appears to us, equivalent in its effects to a right of positive nomination." The other accompanying bill contained an oath of absolute recognition not only of the civil but even of the ecclesiastical supremacy of the Crown. This twofold bill, in short, was only a revival of the veto bill of 1813. Dr. Poynter, and all the vicars apostolic except Dr. Milner, were amongst those who had signed the petition, conceding everything which conscience could possibly allow, declaring, in opposition to what the bishop of Peterborough had said in the House of Lords, that they swore to the king "full and undivided allegiance" and maintained that no foreign prince, prelate, or state, had power or authority to use the civil sword "within the said realm, in any matter or cause whatever, whether civil, spiritual, or ecclesiastical." Greatly then were they disappointed when the new oath and other features of the bill made their appearance. Dr. Poynter, in vain, drew the attention of some of the members to the difference between the civil and spiritual power (March, 1821). In vain, too, he reminded them that the term ecclesiastical, as applied to the courts ecclesiastical of the Church of England, was not a correlative for spiritual, but was in some degree mixed; a tribunal of both civil and spiritual power. Some modifications were, indeed, introduced, even to such an extent as to make the oath comparatively harmless; but although Dr. Poynter did not actively oppose the bill, he found it still im-

* Sup. Mem. p. 255.

possible to give it his entire approbation. Dr. Milner's opposition was as uncompromising as ever. A petition against the pretended relief, numerously signed by the Catholics of the Midland district, was presented to the House. Its appearance was greeted as a triumph by the opponents of the measure, whilst Sir James Mackintosh endeavoured to throw some discredit upon it, by asserting that no leading name was attached to it except that of Dr. Milner.

The bill finally passed the Commons by a majority of nineteen (April 2), but was speedily thrown out by the Lords.*

Whilst Dr. Milner, through good report and evil report, fought the good fight thus manfully, his spirits and his mortal frame were not equal to his indomitable will. In a brief note to Mr. Birch, the president of "Sedgley Park College," he tells him that he sends him his horse to be taken care of, because "I have no heart to ride on these days." † In fact, this valiant but sometimes over-eager combatant, was nearly worn out with half a century of unsparing labour. In addition to this, he had been cautioned by the Holy See to subdue his manner, and to refrain from contributing, by word or writing, to the independent but somewhat violent pages of the Orthodox Journal.

Another effort for carrying a relief bill had been made and defeated, when the good old bishop's days drew to a close. Finding himself near his end, he received the viaticum on his knees, and calmly awaited the coming of his Judge and Saviour. Meantime, the

* But. Hist. Mem. vol. iv. p. 439, &c.; and App. pp. 488—496, and 499. (The paging towards the end of this volume is repeated, causing some confusion.) The oath in its modified form declares that no foreign prince, prelate, &c., hath, or ought to have, any power, &c., ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm that in any manner.....interferes with the duty of full and undivided allegiance [so far so good; but then comes an awkward clause] which by the laws of this realm is due to his majesty," &c. Now, "by the laws of this realm," obedience was required in matters purely spiritual.

† The note is written at the end of a printed "Letter of Thanks" to Mr. Wilberforce, M.P. Its only date is the printed one of 1821.

annual meeting of his clergy arrived, Sedgley Park being the place of meeting. As, one after another, the priests arrived, they hastened to see him to take their last farewell, and beg his blessing. When afterwards the business of the day was over, and the clergy were seated in the Park refectory, the tidings came that their zealous bishop was no more: they immediately rose, and hastened to the chapel to pray for his departed spirit. He had expired with all the sentiments of a contrite and humble heart. Before his death he had re-examined all his writings, and although he found nothing to retract in their substance, he expressed his grief for the hasty expressions which had sometimes escaped his pen (April 19, 1826).*

Milner was of moderate height, and stoutly built. He was rather deficient in polish; and this, added to his farmer-like figure and habitual absence of mind, produced upon strangers a somewhat disagreeable impression. Yet he could bear to be rallied from his abstracted mood, and with the greatest good humour. He was of a most tender heart, being kind to animals, and exceedingly fond of children. It was his delight to see the Sedgley Park boys, and ask them questions upon the Catechism. His determination of character is impressed upon his very busts and portraits. His simplicity was that which springs from humility of heart and singleness of intention. When he was as yet a priest at Winchester, he wrote his "Letters to a Prebendary." When it was ready for the press, he very properly submitted it to his bishop, Dr. Douglas. The latter said, after looking at the manuscript, that if he used his pen at all, he must use it freely, as many of the passages were too strong. Milner acquiesced, and received back his work with the erasure of nearly one-half of its original contents. He made no demur, but printed it as he received it.

His most prominent characteristic, however, is his

* See his life in the Truthteller, pp. 189, 190, and 507; and Husenbeth's Sedg. Park, p. 210. The other part of the account is from persons about him.

untiring, uncompromising, but generally most enlightened zeal. It was not a zeal that spent itself upon details, or upon the objects of the present moment; it looked through all these to the end, to the sanctification of himself and of those under his charge. During all the troubles that beset him in the course of the veto question, he was toiling to complete the struggling seminary of Oscott. He was not content with his first success. He next endeavoured to draw both the students and professors, and his clergy upon the mission, into a voluntary association for preserving and increasing their fervour and disengagement from the world. This object was not lost sight of during his pressing business at Rome in 1814. As soon as the first examinations of his cause were over, he petitioned, through Cardinal Litta, for the Pope's approbation of this society, and for one day's plenary indulgence. The Pope granted the approbation, and all the indulgences attached to the sodality of the Sacred Heart at Rome. This association still exists, being perhaps the first in England in which the devotions of the Sacred Heart and the Rosary were publicly recited. A little Gothic chapel, at Old Oscott, containing a stained-glass window of our Lord disclosing his sacred heart, was the place where the sodality met for its monthly devotions; and although it is now assigned to the good nuns of the Orphanage, it is still a monument of Milner's taste and zeal, and especially of his love of the most loving heart of Jesus.*

Milner's zeal was so keen as well as uncompromis-

* See the printed rules, &c., of the "Institutio Societatis Liberæ Clericorum Sæcularium in Medio Districtu Angliæ." The rules are very easy: one half-hour's meditation, the Angelus, the third part of the Rosary, the Pater, Ave, and Creed, with a little couplet in honour of the Sacred Heart, and the evening examination of conscience, form the principal items of its daily routine. That private sodalities of the Rosary existed in the very midst of the persecutions there can be no doubt. For one instance in the middle of the 17th century, the earl of Cardigan being prefect of the sodality, see "Collections," &c. Eng. Bened. Congr. in Rambler, vii. p. 313.

ing, that one suspicious phrase was enough to excite it. On the title-page of a copy of Lingard's England, there is still to be seen a remark in the bishop's handwriting, bidding "the pious Oscotian" compare various passages in that historian's account of St. Thomas, with the prayer of the Church beginning:—"O God, for whose Church the glorious martyr fell beneath the swords of the impious." * In a copy of Butler's Historical Memoirs, the same hand has written, "Refused." Against the early editions of the "Faith of Catholics," as containing some of the inaccuracies of its original groundwork, the "Principles to God and the Country" he always resolutely set his face.†

Yet his zeal was neither blind nor bitter. If his expressions are sometimes apparently too strong, his desire of the salvation of Charles Butler and others, against whom he thought it necessary to wage incessant war, is repeatedly and strikingly manifest. When the thirteen priests, who are known as the Staffordshire clergy, were supporting first Wilks against his bishop, and then the proceedings of the committee in the Blue Book controversy, or, as it is often called, the Staffordshire schism, Dr. Milner neither issued any ecclesiastical censure, nor made use of any other authority than the earnest reasoning and expostulation of a father. Finding that the Thirteen often assembled at Sedgley Park, where Mr. Southworth, one of their number, was president, Dr. Milner often appeared amongst them, not so much to silence them as to call their attention to reasons and facts which had escaped their notice. A zeal thus tempered by prudence and patience was not without its reward. Some of the thirteen by degrees abandoned the alliance, "till by the grace of God they all successively, either in health or on their death-beds, fully retracted them." ‡

* The copy is now in the library of the bishop's house, Birmingham.

† This is a mere statement of fact; and has no reference whatever to subsequent editions of the "Faith of Catholics."

‡ Sup. Mem. p. 93.

CHAPTER XXXII.

EFFORTS FOR EMANCIPATION IN IRELAND — THE IRISH BISHOPS BEFORE THE HOUSE OF COMMONS—SIDNEY SMITH'S LETTER—THE "DECLARATION" OF THE VICARS APOSTOLIC—DEATH OF DR. POYNTER—DR. MILNER'S SENTIMENTS REGARDING HIM—EMANCIPATION—RETROSPECT OF HALF A CENTURY—ABBÉ BARRUEL'S OPINIONS OF THE ENGLISH CATHOLICS—PRECAUTIONS STILL TAKEN BY CATHOLICS.

Dr. Milner, nearly twelve years before his death, had assured the Pope that emancipation was certain, was only a work of time. That time was now fast approaching. Ireland was resolute in its demand. Ever since the American war it had displayed a new spirit, the spirit of a freeman. The Presbyterian revolt of 1798, so often ascribed to Catholics, and the subsequent Orange reign of terror, failed to crush it. In its five successive associations it had exerted this spirit, at first timidly, and at last with a boldness that astonished and perplexed the government.

It was in vain that the Press was teeming with calumnies, old and new, against the Church, and against its most zealous bishops; against all that was Catholic, all that stood out in striking contrast with Protestantism. The Irish nation was only the more aroused by these insulting and often-refuted charges. A well-organized minority has often conquered, but the vast majority of a nation acting as one man under fearless leaders, of whom O'Connell was now becoming the decided head,—this was a power both new and resistless. The English Catholics had, comparatively, but little to do: their battle was fought and won in the Emerald Isle.

Finding that a "Suppression Bill" which he had directed against the Catholic Association only led to a

more energetic organization, Lord Liverpool, the prime minister, found it necessary, in the following year, to treat with the leaders. A delegation of the Irish bishops was examined before a committee of the House of Commons, upon the Pope's authority and other topics in connection with the veto. Their answers could not have been without effect upon candid and inquiring minds; but nothing was done, although, from the activity and high tone of the Whigs, it was evident that something important was expected. In fact, the Tories, by their examination of the bishops, had retreated, had made a signal acknowledgment of weakness; and the Whigs, who for twenty years had sought in vain to win their way to office, perceived and pressed their own advantage. Their pamphleteers were vigorously contending with those of the Tories; and the cause itself which they had now adopted, no less than the experience and abilities of several of the Whig writers, achieved for them several decided triumphs. Although the object of many of these writers was purely political, the good which was accomplished by removing prejudices against the Catholics, cannot be over-estimated. Amongst the most effective of these writers was Sidney Smith, a Protestant clergyman. Few that were living at the time, will forget the effect of his "Letter to the Electors on the Catholic Question."

Having, in his usual clear and well-illustrated manner, answered a variety of popular objections against the Catholics, he at last declares that there were faults on both sides; and, in proof of this, quotes a "code drawn up by the French Catholics against the French Protestants." After a terrific list of fines, imprisonments, and death, to be inflicted according to circumstances, he suddenly exclaims: "Forgive, gentle reader, and gentle elector, the trifling deception I have practised upon you. This code is not a code made by French Catholics against French Protestants, but by English and Irish Protestants against English and Irish Catholics. I have given it to you, for the most

part, as it is set forth in Burn's 'Justice' of 1780: it was acted upon in the beginning of the last king's reign, and was notorious through the whole of Europe, as the most cruel and atrocious system of persecution ever instituted by one religious persuasion against another." *

"The uncandid excuse for all this is, that the greater part of these men were put to death for political, not for religious, crimes; that is, a law is first passed making it high treason for a priest to exercise his function in England, and so when he is caught and burnt, this is not religious persecution, but an offence against the state. We are, I hope, all too busy to need any answer to such childish, uncandid, reasoning as this."

To the existence amongst the Catholic gentry of that high genuine honour which prefers any privation to the sale of one's conscience, he thus bears witness: "Is there a more disgraceful spectacle in the world than that of the duke of Norfolk hovering round the House of Lords in the execution of his office, which he cannot enter as a peer of the realm? Disgraceful to the bigotry and injustice of his country, to his own sense of duty honourable in the extreme: he is the leader of a band of ancient and high-principled gentlemen, who submit patiently to obscurity and privation rather than do violence to their conscience. In all the fury of party, I never heard the name of a single Catholic mentioned who was suspected of having gained or aimed at any political advantage by violating his oath."

His remarks may be appropriately closed by this piece of advice: "I recommend all young men who wish to form some notion of what answer the Catholics have to make, to read Milner's Letters to a Prebendary, and to follow the line of reading to which his references lead. They will then learn the importance of that sacred maxim, *Audi alteram partem*." †

* Letter to the Electors, 2nd ed. 1826 (towards the end).

† Ib. pp. 2, 34, 35, and note p. 34.

In the same year (A.D. 1826) in which Sidney Smith was thus shaking down inveterate prejudices, the well-known "Declaration" of all the vicars apostolic was made, and must have had a powerful effect on the minds of its readers. In calm and dispassionate language it stated the true teaching of the Church on the grounds of faith, the reading of the Holy Scriptures, the power of forgiving sins, the obligations of an oath, and other misrepresented topics.*

The combined effect of all these efforts was soon manifest, but for the present the crisis was delayed by the repeated changes of the cabinet. Whilst this politico-religious struggle was thus pausing in the very midst of its career, the London clergy were afflicted by the illness and death of Dr. Poynter. This amiable prelate expired on 11th of December, 1827. He had provided an able successor in the mirthful, clear-sighted Dr. Bramston, who from a Protestant lawyer had become a convert and a priest; then vicar-general, the right hand of his bishop both at Rome and in England, and finally his coadjutor and successor.

When the remains of the mild, peace-loving Dr. Poynter were brought into the chapel of Moorfields, for the usual service for the dead (Dec. 11, 1827), it was impossible for those who were then mournfully but silently calling to mind his past career, not to call to mind, at the same time, the bishop who had preached his consecration sermon; who himself had been consecrated but a few days before that sermon; who shared, though often in a very different manner, in all Dr. Poynter's solicitude for the Church in England; who had frequently thought it his duty to withstand his brother-bishop; and who had gone but a few months before him into the house of his eternity. A moment's reflection upon the episcopal life of Dr. Poynter could not fail to evoke the remembrance of the departed Milner. When, therefore,

* For a specimen of this brief but able work, see App. N.

Mr. Havard mounted the pulpit at the funeral of Dr. Poynter, the numerous congregation of clergy and laity there assembled must have felt their hearts thrill with responsive feeling, as the preacher thus briefly touched upon this sad but interesting theme: "I deem it a conscientious duty to testify, that the illustrious Dr. Milner, not very long before his death, declared to me, respecting the venerable Dr. Poynter, in words which, coming from any one else, might be construed into flattery, but he was not accustomed to flatter—he declared, with emotions scarcely susceptible of description, that he entertained the most unbounded veneration for the virtues, piety, and edifying character of Dr. Poynter, and that he would give the universe to possess half his merit in the sight of God. The disclosure during his life would have offended his sincere humility, and for that reason it was not made; but I now thus publicly aver the fact, with inexpressible satisfaction, for the credit of both. They were both men of great and undeniable virtue, but of different character and disposition. They both considered themselves as sentinels placed on the watch-tower. If the Church of Christ has been illustrated by a St. Augustin and an amiable Fénélon, it has been equally illustrated by an inflexible Bossuet and a rigid St. Jerome. Difference of opinion will exist between the best of men, and what wonder? Did not St. Paul, the apostle of the Gentiles, differ from St. Peter, the prince of the Apostles?"*

Not many months after Dr. Poynter's decease, the crisis which the whole united empire was awaiting in breathless suspense was suddenly terminated. Seizing their opportunity, the Whigs, in 1828, carried in the Commons, despite the efforts of the ministry, a bill for the repeal of the Test and Corporation oaths. The defeated ministers made no further opposition;

* The Rev. Lewis Havard's "Funeral Discourse." "Their esteem," Mr. Havard testifies, "was perfectly reciprocal. Speaking of the death of Dr. Milner, our venerable prelate exclaimed with emphasis—'He was a St. Jerome'" (p. 20, note).

and thus the bill was allowed to pass. The duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel were now at the head of the government, and were pledged to withstand the bill of relief. Yet even the "Iron Duke" was uneasy at the aspect of Ireland, and Peel's apprehensions were little short of actual terror.* They, therefore, resigned; but, in a few hours, at the king's request, again accepted office; and, to the astonishment of their Tory partisans, introduced a relief bill which, in the case of Catholics, swept away the oaths of supremacy and abjuration, thus re-opening to them the houses of parliament, and nearly every post in the army, navy, and government. In place of the oaths thus abolished, one was substituted which promised fidelity to the Protestant succession of the house of Brunswick, the defence of the actual legal settlement of property, and the abjuring on the part of Catholic members of parliament of any intention "to subvert the present Church establishment as settled by law in this land, or to disturb or weaken the Protestant religion or Protestant government." †

The Catholics were forbidden by this bill to assume the titles of the sees occupied by Protestants. There was a clause added, which betrays a remnant of the old calumnious spirit: the Jesuits and the monastic orders of men were to be, gradually, suppressed; but, as more than a quarter of a century has now elapsed since the "Act of Emancipation" (1829), we may reasonably infer that the clause was never intended to be put in practice; and that it is now, at all events, entirely obsolete. It may also be inferred, and with still greater reason, that the numerous penalties against us which are still upon the statute-book have become, not only in practice, but in the eye of the law, completely obsolete. It must be acknowledged, on the other hand, that it is more easy to revive a dormant law, than to re-enact what has altogether ceased to exist.

* Lord Mahon's Memoirs of Peel, 1856.

† See the oath in App. P.

Having thus at length passed the transition-period from proscription to comparative freedom and security, we may naturally pause to take a parting glance at the state of things from which we have thus emerged.

The impression produced by the English Catholics upon the French emigrant clergy, is thus briefly told by one of their number, the Abbé Barruel. The French emigrants, he says, found in every chapel, "a congregation, the decency of whose deportment, and whose recollected air, bespoke them to be chosen souls, the favourite children of Jesus Christ, whose piety added a lustre to their constancy. A zealous and edifying clergy cultivated this precious portion of the vineyard. Four bishops, under the title of apostolical vicars, governed by their virtues and their examples more effectually than by their authority."*

As the nature of Barruel's work did not allow him to say more upon this interesting subject, the domestic condition of Catholics, at the close of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries, must be surmised from surviving but authentic traditions.

There have been living within the last twenty years, old people, in Birmingham and other provincial towns, who used to tell how, in their younger days, they stole out, one by one, on Sundays and holidays, and took some circuitous course, to reach unobserved the carefully secluded chapel. This chapel, if in the country, was oftentimes (as at Long Birch, near Wolverhampton, Blackmore Park, near Malvern, Sedgley Park, and many other places), a mere upper room, as decently adorned, of course, as circumstances allowed, but seldom or never cheered by the lamp of the Blessed Sacrament. Nor was such a position for the chapel considered a sufficient protection: various were the external precautions. To this day, there is pointed out on an estate of the earls of Shrewsbury, near Newport, an approach to the house, winding up the ascent amongst a dense covering of hedges and trees,

* Barr.'s Hist. of the Clergy, p. 382, Dublin, 1794.

and then diving beneath the high road, and so, at last, conducting in strictest privacy to the house, and finally to the chapel.

Where the approach was less concealed, or, indeed, in almost all cases, there was generally on the watch a person who knew the congregation, and would exclude without ceremony every one who awakened his keen-sighted suspicions. This precaution was necessary, as that generation remembered well the days when priests were still informed against; but it was, sometimes, an unfortunate circumstance for strangers. At the end of last century, a Catholic of the poorer class, living near Tamworth, wished, as it was Christmas-eve, to approach the Sacraments. He knew, it seems, of no chapel nearer than that at Sedgley Park. To this, accordingly, when the day's work was over, he directed his steps; thinking perhaps of the shepherds going to Bethlehem. He arrived in time for the first Mass; but the watcher saw something in his appearance which he could scarcely trust, and refused him admittance. The poor man, yearning for the bread of life, kept his soul in patience, and waited his opportunity. When several cold hours had thus passed, some of the inmates were touched with the hardness of his case, made the necessary inquiries and cross-examinations, and finally procured him admission. Through such difficulties did the poorer Catholics struggle on, not unfrequently, in order to be able to approach the Sacraments.

The very external appearance, and the favourite sites of those chapels that bold though cautious men, like Father Broomhead of Manchester, began to erect in the larger country towns, told with what a timid step the Catholic services were again venturing into the resorts of men.

Even in London, where the residence of the ambassadors of Catholic princes, as well as the multitude of the population, and the concourse of strangers, afforded facilities unknown in the country, great precautions were necessary. It is easy to remember how indus-

triously, even but thirty years ago, Warwick-street, and South-street, and other chapels, were made to keep a strong external resemblance to the stables, in the midst of which they had been purposely erected. It was Christ, not indeed on Thabor, nor any longer absolutely on Calvary, but certainly at Bethlehem. The studied meanness of the exterior of the chapels was, however, less extraordinary than the contrivances to which it was sometimes necessary to have recourse for the instruction of the people. Eye-witnesses have testified to those that are still living, that in the neighbourhood of Lincoln's-Inn Fields, the Catholics used to assemble in a public-house, as if some kind of club, and the priest amongst them; and thus, when pots of beer, intended to conceal their real purpose, were placed before them, and they were left to themselves, did they listen to the words of life: "Blessed is he that is not scandalized in me."*

* A very similar account is handed down of Dr. Challoner's way (probably in those "worst of times" of which Milner speaks) of collecting his people.—See Price's Sick Calls, "The Dying Shirt-Maker."

CHAPTER XXXIII.

A SUMMARY TO THE PRESENT TIME:—CARDINAL WELD—STONYHURST—THE JESUITS RESTORED—THE "OXFORD MOVEMENT"—ITS ORIGIN AND PROGRESS—LITTLEMORE CONVERSIONS—THE ORATORIANS—DR. BAINES AND PRIOR PARK—DR. GRIFFITHS—THE VICARS APOSTOLIC INCREASED—PETITIONS FOR THE RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF THE HIERARCHY—DR. WALSH, THE LAST VICAR APOSTOLIC OF LONDON—HIS DEATH—PUGIN—OSCOTT—DECREE FOR THE RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF THE HIERARCHY—A RETROSPECT—CONCLUSION.

Soon after the passing of the Act of Emancipation, the English Catholics were gladdened by the elevation of one of their number to the dignity of a prince of the Church. This was the unobtrusive, but charitable and pious, Cardinal Thomas Weld. He had been educated by Rev. Charles Plowden. He concurred with his father in bestowing the mansion of Stonyhurst upon the suppressed Jesuits, who, although no longer a religious community, were still devoting themselves, as far as possible, to the important task of education. The gift of the mansion for such a purpose, and to the remains of a suppressed order, excited doubts and reclamation on the part of Dr. Gibson, the vicar apostolic of the North. Every difficulty, however, was removed on the restoration of the order in 1814.* On becoming a widower, and bestowing the hand of his daughter, an only child, upon Lord Clifford, Mr. Weld studied theology, and was ordained priest (A.D. 1821).

* The Jesuits were restored within the limits of Russia on March 7, 1801, and within those of the kingdom of the Two Sicilies on July 30, 1804. At the urgent request of the whole Church, the Pope restored to the bark of Peter, in 1814, "the strong and skilful rowers" who were thus presented to him.—See the Pope's Bull, "7 Idûs Aug."

After having served on the mission at Chelsea, he was consecrated coadjutor bishop of Upper Canada; but his physicians having forbid his voyage to America, he did duty at the convent at Hammersmith. Going afterwards to Rome, he was appointed cardinal (A.D. 1830). The guardianship of the Catholic Church in the British colonies became his especial duty; but his health, already enfeebled, sank under this heavy responsibility. He died the death of the just on the 10th of April, 1837. His funeral oration was pronounced by Dr. Wiseman, the present cardinal (A.D. 1837).*

A little before his death, what is now familiarly known as the Oxford movement began to attract the attention of some few Catholics, and especially of Dr. Wiseman, who was then the president of the English college at Rome. It was to lend some assistance to souls aroused by that movement to look around for help, that he, soon after, began the "Dublin Review." What followed, however, was far less the work of even so gifted a man, than of a marvellous grace operating, individually at first, in the souls, and in the practices, it may be added, of those who were foremost in the movement.

It was different from anything before seen from the beginning of the Reformation. Converts have at all times been returning from Protestantism to the One Fold, and amongst them clergymen too, as these pages have repeatedly though incidentally witnessed. In the Oxford movement, however, the conversion has not been of one or two, but of one or two hundred, at the lowest estimate, of Anglican clergymen alone.

This movement, however, was by no means a sudden crisis; it was the slow growth of many previous years. The storm of the French Revolution, that seemed to be winged only with wrath and destruction, was, apparently, the means by which God flung the seed of the faith broadcast upon certain parts of England.

* See his Funeral Oration by Dr. Wiseman; or Directory of 1838.

One of the professors of Oxford, most intimate with the French refugees, was Dr. Charles Lloyd, the tutor of the late Sir Robert Peel, and afterwards bishop of Oxford. When he became Regius Professor of Divinity, he gave a course of lectures, unusual in their subject, and, still more, in their development. His subject was, the "History and Structure of the Anglican Prayer-book." His manner of developing the subject was that of a Catholic, and points at once to his familiarity with the customs of the French ecclesiastics.* He laid it down as a main principle, that the Prayer-book was in great measure a mere compilation from the Missal and Breviary; and, accordingly, he made an examination of these manuals of the Catholic clergy the principal feature in his lectures. His students were of course obliged to procure a supply from a Catholic bookseller; and poor Booker, of Bond Street, was quite aghast at the extent of the demand. He had not forgotten the riots of '80, and he feared that some other scheme was in agitation. It was not until he was reassured by one of the Oxford men whom he knew, that he would become the agent of "a free importation of Missals and Breviaries into Oxford."

That Oxford man is the present Canon Oakeley; and amongst the others who attended Dr. Lloyd's lectures were "John Henry Newman and Edward Pusey (though of older standing than the majority of the class); and among those somewhat junior, Mr. (late Archdeacon) Wilberforce, Mr. Froude, the late bishop of Salisbury, and many others." †

The result of a thorough study of the Missal and Breviary could scarcely be otherwise than beneficial; and the discovery of the true nature of the Anglican

* "He had spent a portion of his earlier life in the company of French ecclesiastics, and from their conversation and example had received an idea of Catholic doctrines and Catholic life very different from that which prevails among the great body of Protestants."—Can. Oakeley's "Personal Reminiscences of the Oxford Movement," p. 4, Lond. 1855.

† Ib. pp. 4—6.

Prayer-book must have opened to the active and inquisitive mind many a subject, sometimes of interesting, and often of perplexing inquiry.

Their effect upon Froude, and through him upon Newman, is thus described by Oakeley:—"There was not one of the class upon whom these lectures appeared to make so deep an impression as the late Richard Hurrell Froude. Unlike most others of his party, Mr. Froude never wavered in his allegiance to Catholic principles, or, at any rate, to religious principles which were immensely in advance of his generation. In him, Dr. Lloyd's teaching on the subject of liturgies found a mind ripe, at the age of one-and-twenty, for receiving impressions favourable even to the Roman Church, and strongly adverse to the Reformation. Each year of his short life these impressions grew deeper, and were moulded into settled and most energetic convictions by the help of personal austerities, retirement, study, and prayer, till at length (like all real and matured convictions) they began to tell upon the world. What in Dr. Lloyd was a 'view,' in Mr. Froude settled into a motive; and what with many of Dr. Lloyd's pupils would probably have lived and died away as a mere fashion, took extensive root under Mr. Froude's influence, and eventually germinated into something intensely and powerfully practical. In short, it was not long before Mr. Froude made a conquest of Mr. Newman."* Newman's mind was probably well prepared for such a conquest, not only by Dr. Lloyd's lectures, but by that deep love of the writings of the Fathers which he had imbibed even in his boyhood. This double impression was not left by Providence to work out its own unaided conclusions; it was to be fostered and matured by many combining circumstances.

The High Church party had been greatly startled by the passing of the Act of Emancipation. Their antagonist was no longer in fetters; and they felt, and

* Person. Remin. p. 6.

no wonder, an instinctive terror. With this feeling still upon them, they were amazed to see their favourite theories tottering under the shocks of the French and Polish revolutions of 1830, and the Reform Bill of 1832, and, still more, under the clamour for sweeping reforms in the Establishment itself, and under the consequent suppression, by act of parliament, of no fewer than ten of the Irish bishoprics.

No less an effort than the arresting of these hostile tendencies was determined upon, not, indeed, by the whole party, but by a little band of four young men, aided by some personal friends. It seemed to be madness, and yet their bold and persevering exertions, combined with the exhaustion of political parties, deferred for a while the evil day of the Establishment, and produced other consequences altogether unforeseen.

The men who thus united were all Anglican clergymen. They were Rose, the editor of the "British Magazine;" William Palmer, well known for his "Origines Liturgicæ" and other works, and for his controversy with Cardinal Wiseman, then bishop of Melipotamus; Keble, the author of the "Christian Year" and other poems; and Newman, whose parochial sermons at St. Mary's, Protestant in form as they still were, were yet almost Catholic in spirit, and were producing upon the young men of the university a deep and even unexampled impression.

These men, however, few as they were, could scarcely agree upon either the objects or the manner of their attempt. Something, however, they were determined to do; and therefore, as a beginning, they came to an understanding to defend the apostolical succession as essential to the idea of a church (A.D. 1833).

Then began the movement which had attracted the eyes of Catholics, and, indeed, of the entire nation. Palmer busily canvassed the whole country for subscriptions to certain petitions, which were to be laid

before the bishops, and which were vague enough for almost any shade of Anglican belief. The "Tracts for the Times" were speedily begun, at first in the usual Protestant style, and then by degrees, and especially from the time of Dr. Hampden's contest for the regius professorship of divinity, in a tone which elicited from the Evangelicals the cry of Popery (A.D. 1836). The articles called the "Church of the Fathers," from Newman's pen, appeared meantime in the "British Magazine."

After these first literary essays, and after many a contest between the "British Critic" (now Puseyite) and the "Edinburgh Review," and various sermons and pamphlets in attack and reply, the leaders of the movement turned from Anglican divines to the Fathers, hoping to find in the latter the defence of the former. That no one might complain of garbled passages, it was determined to publish some of them entire. "By way then," says Newman himself, "of rescuing the faith from private teaching on the one hand, and private judgment on the other, it was proposed to publish a library of the Fathers translated into English" (A.D. 1838). These studies, so important in themselves, so congenial to Newman's disposition, produced a decisive effect. "Turning their minds (some of them at least) more carefully to the doctrinal controversies of the early Church, they saw distinctly that in the reasonings of the Fathers, elicited by means of them, and in the decisions of authority in which they issued, were contained the rudiments at least, the anticipations, the justification, of what they had been accustomed to consider the corruptions of Rome." *

Whilst the public, both Catholic and Protestant, were watching and wondering, and many of the former were earnestly praying, great internal changes had taken place in the party of the movement. Froude

* "Difficulties felt by the Anglicans" (Lect. v. pp. 122 and 124). See also Capes' "Rise, Progress, and Results of Puseyism," Rambler, December, 1850.

was now no more, although the first volumes of his "Remains" were widely diffusing his maxims and spirit; Rose had from the beginning remained aloof; Palmer had diverged into ultra-Protestantism; and Pusey, who had taken some part in writing the Tracts, especially on baptismal regeneration, and whose name had been given, perhaps erroneously, to the whole movement, was doing but little except in personal austerities. It was already evident, that the real leader of all those who were thoroughly in earnest was Newman. His parochial sermons which he had been delivering at St. Mary's ever since 1828, and which were now issuing from the press, were producing, it seems, a more powerful effect than even the "Church of the Fathers." So widely was his influence extending, that even the "Times," the alternate slave and guide of public opinion, invited him to write in its columns, and espoused for a time the cause of Tractarianism.

As time wore on, many of his followers began to see clearly the real nature of the Catholic Church, and one after another took refuge in the One Fold. The main party, however, held together; but their writings and sayings were so strangely at variance with Protestantism, that both Catholics and Protestants were astonished that they could thus cling to the Establishment.

At last it seemed as if a crisis had occurred. Tract No. 90 made its appearance, and the whole country was in a state of agitation. This tract maintained that the Thirty-nine Articles were susceptible of a Catholic interpretation, and could be subscribed by a person holding all the dogmas of the Council of Trent. All Protestantism rose up in universal clamour at such an announcement. As, however, it became known that, at the suggestion of the bishop of Oxford, no more Tracts were to be printed, the tumult subsided, and the crisis passed (March, 1841). In little more than two years the "British Critic" likewise came to a termination. A still greater agitation pervaded Oxford, and more or less the whole country, when

Ward published his "Ideal of a Christian Church;" in which he exposed the hollowness of Protestantism, and declared that he maintained all the doctrines of the Council of Trent. After six months of excitement and pamphleteering he was degraded (Feb. 13, 1845).

For some time before the appearance of the "Ideal," it seemed as if the movement had exhausted itself; and Catholics were already trembling for souls that seemed to have received a great grace, and yet to be now sinking in the waves of error, when they were surprised by an indication more striking than any previous one, because more eminently marked by the spirit of obedience and genuine self-denial. This was the establishment of a college or community at Littlemore, near Oxford. To Father Dominic, who first brought the Passionists to England, this anomalous but fervent institution appeared, in its austerities and exact obedience, like one of the Catholic monasteries of strict observance. Littlemore was a nucleus for those who, still thinking that they might be saved in the Church of England, appeared ready to make every sacrifice for the kingdom of heaven. But now, whilst the Puseyite press was teeming with Lives of the English Saints and other devotional works, the real crisis took place: another sacrifice of a totally different nature was demanded.

Perceiving how strong were the claims of "Rome" to their full submission to her authority, some of the party still for a while dreamed of a spiritual allegiance both to "England and Rome." They dreamed of a union between the Church of England and the Catholic Church, in which the most cherished observances of the latter, the celibacy, for instance, of the clergy, were to be sacrificed. They were, however, less harsh, less unfilial (if such an expression can be admitted), in their feelings towards the Holy See, than the generality of those who had in former times, whether in England or on the Continent, toyed for a while, rather than earnestly grappled, with the theory of such a union.

The Catholics, not only in England, but on the Continent, were deeply moved when they saw that Littlemore was devoting itself not merely to study, but to fasting and prayer; and they, too, offered their prayers and the holy sacrifice for the poor struggling shipwrecked men, and wondered why they did not grasp the hands stretched out to receive them. At length they were consoled. Newman, it was whispered, was really in doubt. Dr. Wiseman's articles on the Donatists confirmed his doubts. Then, a short visit from Father Dominic, and the sacrifice was made—the sacrifice of benefices, preferments, position, and friends; and Newman and his little band were safe in the Church at last (Oct. 1845). Their conversion was followed by that of some hundreds of others. The great learning of many of the converts is too well known to need any comment, and the public acknowledgment, on the Achilli trial, of Dr. Newman's worth and acquirements, must be fresh on everybody's memory; but their repeated sacrifices of almost everything to which human nature clings, is little known except to their Father in heaven. To some of these devoted men do we owe it, that the Oratorians, the devoted children of St. Philip Neri, have their two flourishing houses and churches at Brompton and Edgbaston. Dr. Newman himself is now laboriously, but it is to be hoped successfully, constructing a great work for the renovation of Ireland, and England too, and it may be, of half the world—the University of Dublin.*

The vicars apostolic during the earlier part of the Oxford movement, were Dr. Walsh, Dr. Baines, Dr. Griffiths, and Dr. Briggs. The last-mentioned is the present bishop of Beverley. Of the other three, some brief notice is necessary, in order to complete the present outline of Catholic affairs.

Dr. Baines, the vicar apostolic of the Western district, was a Benedictine, a man of great talent and

* "Rise, Progress," &c. Rambler, January—March, 1851; Person. Remin. p. 16, &c.

affability, and an excellent preacher. Being about to establish "a diocesan college," he desired that it should be such, when once the missions were supplied, "as would allow the ecclesiastical student to complete and digest his studies." Having, therefore, opened for this purpose St. Peter's College, Prior Park, his next anxiety was for a college for the laity. He believed that the existing colleges presented to Catholic youth no "adequate substitute" for the want of public universities. To supply the deficiency, he erected the college of St. Paul's for young men of the laity (Nov. 21, 1836). Most praiseworthy was the good bishop's object, but the misfortune was, that he seems to have considered the idea of a university to be inseparable from that of architectural splendour; and for this his means were quite insufficient. Why dwell upon so sad a theme? The difficulty of the undertaking, increased as it was by a calamitous fire, seems to have brought on his own death, and that of Dr. Baggs, his most amiable and learned, but short-lived successor, as well as that of a third bishop, the indefatigable Dr. Burgess; and, at length, has terminated in the lamentable dissolution of the colleges of Prior Park.*

Dr. Griffiths, of the London district, was a striking contrast to Dr. Baines: he was rather a useful than a shining character. Although accustomed, when at Old Hall, to preach, yet, whether from want of nerve or time, he has often when giving his confirmation instructions, read them from a manuscript concealed in his pontifical. His talents for business, however, were of the highest order, as St. Edmund's College experienced, when it was almost overpowered with incumbrances. As a bishop, he was exceedingly laborious and methodical in all the details of ecclesi-

* "Their connection," Dr. Baines declared, speaking of the colleges lost in the French Revolution, "with foreign colleges and universities gave them advantages in a literary point of view, which we cannot possess at home."—See his "Address" at the opening of St. Paul's, Cath. Mag. 1837, p. 255, &c.

astical affairs. Having despatched these public duties, he gave all his remaining time to his devotions. He was seldom or never seen at parties. When he was in public, he looked neither to the right nor the left, but, with a recollected countenance, moved on to his destination. He was diminutive in person, of dark complexion, and small-featured. His pontificate was marked not only by punctuality in money transactions, but by a considerable increase in the sermons and general devotions assigned to the week-days of Lent.

Some time before his death the number of vicars apostolic had been increased by Gregory XVI. (A.D. 1840), from four to eight; the Midland district having been divided into two, the Central and the Eastern; and the Northern district having been divided into three, that of the Northern counties, that of Lancashire, and that of Yorkshire; whilst Wales was made a separate vicariate. This increase in the number of bishops would, of course, facilitate their visitations, and insure to them a more accurate knowledge of their respective flocks. The change, however, proved eventually to be but a preparation, whether intended or not, for one far more important, the restoration of the hierarchy.

This restoration had long been desired by a considerable number both of the clergy and laity. It was one of the demands (though to an extent quite impracticable) of the supporters of the "Committee," in the time of the "Blue-book" controversy. It was, much more recently, petitioned for by others, especially in the North and in London, whose zeal and obedience were never impeached.* Even when, in London, there seemed for a short time some division of opinion, after

* "Quod, scilicet, nobis gratissimum foret si ecclesiastica hierarchia in Angliâ restauraretur, ita tamen ut hoc ipsum desiderium nostrum plane submittimus supremo judicio Beatitudinis tuæ," &c.—Protest of the minority regarding the Moorfields Clergy-Library Petition, Oct. 20, 1847. See also the "Supplex Libellus" of the Clergy, &c., and also the Pope's decree for restoring the Hierarchy: "Permultos tam clericos, quam laicos," &c.

the decease of Dr. Griffiths, both the Moorfields and the Chelsea subscribers combined in at least one point—in the expression of their desire for the restoration of the hierarchy (Oct. 1847).

When this desire was afterwards expressed even by the vicars apostolic, the Holy See gave it immediate attention. Dr. Sharples and Dr. Wiseman, the latter of whom was then president of Oscott, and coadjutor of Dr. Walsh, had applied in person to the Pope, praying that the clergy might have a voice in the election of the bishops, and that the episcopal control of the clergy might be placed upon a "definite and canonical footing." A memorial signed by all the vicars apostolic, supported this petition. A congregation of cardinals having discussed it, his Holiness determined to grant it.*

As a step preparatory to the changes thus contemplated, Dr. Walsh, once the coadjutor of Dr. Milner, and now the senior vicar apostolic, was selected to be the first archbishop of Westminster.* For this purpose, notwithstanding his own repugnance, he was removed from the Central district, to become the successor of Dr. Griffiths; but before any further arrangements could be made, this devout and simple-minded prelate breathed his last. If there was a want of method in his accounts, if, whilst canon law was little needed, he departed too widely from its very principles, and thus bequeathed a painful legacy to his diocese, every one that knew him, even while they blame the fact, will acquit the intention. Let it not be forgotten that it was he who first took Pugin by the hand, and gave to his genius that opportunity which has succeeded, at last, in raising the character of our modern ecclesiastical architecture, and its various attendant arts, to something worthy of comparison with even their mediæval prototypes. It was Dr. Walsh, too, aided by the suggestions and co-operation of his coadjutor, the present cardinal,

* See the printed account of a conversation between a deputation of the clergy and Dr. Wiseman, Oct. 26, 1847.

who established the Passionists and other religious orders in this country, and who, in part, enabled Dr. Weedall to build the new college of Oscott, a building thoroughly adapted to its purpose, and which extorted the deliberate approbation of Pugin himself (A.D. 1838). May the laborious, energetic president who raised it, live to see realized that most beautiful vision of what a seminary ought to be, which, in his sermon at the opening, he called up before us in almost living proportions.

Soon after Dr. Walsh's death, the Holy See had completed its arrangements for the hierarchy. The cardinals being of one opinion with his Holiness, Pius IX. decreed, that "the hierarchy of bishops ordinary, taking their titles from their sees, should, according to the usual rules of the Church, again flourish in the kingdom of England." The whole kingdom, together with Wales, was formed into one province, consisting of the metropolitan see of Westminster, and its twelve suffragan sees, of Southwark, Plymouth, Clifton, St. David's and Newport, Shrewsbury, Liverpool, Salford, Hexham, Beverley, Nottingham, Birmingham, and Northampton. To the bishops and archbishop thus constituted the Pope granted all the rights and privileges, placing upon them at the same time all the duties and obligations, of the bishops of other nations, as defined in canon law and by apostolical constitutions. He likewise recalled and abrogated all older privileges and customs whatever (Sept. 30, 1850).*

It does not enter into the object of the present work, to sketch the erection of chapters, and the two synods at Oscott, and other ecclesiastical matters after the re-establishment of the hierarchy. Nor, at the present time, will it be necessary to recall the prolonged but only half-successful attempt to arouse another no-popery agitation; nor the signal triumph instantaneously achieved by the cardinal's "Appeal

* "Litt. Apost. SS. Dom. nostri quibus hierarchia episcopalis in Angliâ restituitur."

to the People of England." Whatever insults, then or afterwards, were offered to chapel or priest, or to the images of Christ and his Blessed Mother, may well for the present be buried in oblivion.*

Notwithstanding this brief trial, great indeed has been the progress of the Church in this country since the deaths of Dr. Milner and Dr. Poynter.

The multiplication of missions is self-evident; and equally so the stanch zeal of the missionary priests in the midst of cholera and fever, even when, as in Liverpool and other parts (A.D. 1847), their fellow-labourers were rapidly falling victims, or rather martyrs, to their heroic charity.

Of the three secular colleges Oscott is new; and Old Hall has erected its noble church; and Ushaw its library and other erections, besides its church and its beautiful accompanying chapels.† The colleges of religious, meantime, have doubled in number. The communities, especially of those nuns that devote themselves to the poor, have multiplied literally a hundredfold. The communities of religious men, though far less numerous, are either prevented, it seems, from practising their ordinary rule by the higher claims of the mission, or are actually fulfilling a rule which circumstances but a few years ago rendered impossible, or at least are manfully struggling to return to it. Few monasteries in Europe can give the heart of St. Dominic more joy than the fervent community at Woodchester. The Passionists are the edification of all that behold their poverty and labours. The children of St. Bernard, beneath the granite-peaked hills of Charnwood Forest, are pursuing their penitential toils amidst perpetual silence and contemplation; and amongst them many a secular priest

* Although the unhappy men, Achilli and Gavazzi, have already, in great measure, had their day, a pastoral of Dr. Milner upon men of similar character will not be inappropriate.—See App. R.

† The English college at Rome had been reopened in 1818. This auspicious event was owing to the influence of Cardinal Consalvi, the representations of Lingard and M'Pherson, and the active zeal of Dr. Gradwell.—Rambler, Sept. 1848.

has taken refuge. Then there are the zealous Redemptorists and the Brothers of Charity; and in their lowly but most meritorious labours, the Christian Brothers, devoting themselves to lead the young to Christ. These—and how many more!—are striving, as far, it seems, as circumstances will allow, to practise the spirit and letter of their institute. And of all that have been here expressly mentioned, none were in the country, in at least their present form, at the era of emancipation. Then amongst the people, what do the efforts for education say? The Poor School Committee, the Brook Green Institute, the Reformatory Schools, and the many other indications of love for the little ones of Christ? Then, again, has not the true Catholic spirit sprung up with a freshness never before witnessed? What St. Bede, more than a thousand years ago, urged Egbert, the archbishop of York, to bring about, has in our own days, and not a little through our present archbishop's exertions, been accomplished: multitudes weekly throng around the table of our Lord, and on the other days, in the larger congregrations, the Mass is seldom said without communicants.* Then, too, through the same exertions has sprung up, and been widely diffused, the beautiful celebrations of the month of May. In short, all that the spouse of Christ most loves, of Mary and the Passion, and the Blessed Sacrament, and the Sacred Heart, has taken root and bloomed and expanded during these five-and-twenty most fruitful years. This, indeed, is true progress, and a pledge, it may be hoped, of future and still greater progress.

After we have thus traced, or rather watched, through so many years the varied fortunes of the Church in this country, will it seem intrusive to offer a brief parting remark upon one or two homely and practical deductions? The writer will at least hazard them, and crave his reader's indulgence.

If at the present day there are difficulties arising

* For some comparatively recent changes regarding days of obligation, &c., see two pastorals, App. S.; see also App. T.

from poverty, persecution, or one's own frailties, have there not been at every step of the past, difficulties equally trying, although sometimes arising from a very different cause? Let us strive, as far as it is our place, either to redress or to mitigate the present evils by endeavouring, as men who "seek the things that are above, not the things that are on the earth," to discharge our own peculiar duties, be we clergy or laity. Let us from both the successes and the failures of the past derive a profit for the present: let us endeavour to win our object, not by the wisdom of the flesh, not by mere learning, nor, if such be the line of our duty, by mere political skill, but by prayer, by the renunciation of our own wills, and by a charity which never surrenders principle, but knows how to compassionate, and forbear, and keep the bond of peace. If thus we press on, looking for the "blessed hope, and the coming of the glory of the great God and our Saviour," we shall ourselves at least win the crown, and can scarcely fail to secure it for others also. In this spirit was the conversion of our Saxon forefathers accomplished. In this spirit too will the designs of God's mercy towards our generation be accomplished. The harvest, however, is great, and the labourers few: "pray ye, therefore, the Lord of the harvest, that he would send labourers into his vineyard."

APPENDIX TO VOLUME II.

[A.]

(*From page* 76.)

SOME DECAY OF THE MONASTIC SPIRIT.

In some of the richer monasteries, a spirit of worldly pomp had long since intruded. For one example: Edward III. petitioned Gregory XI. that in consideration of the many burthens upon the monastery of Durham, he would unite to it the parish church of Hemynburgh. The Pope with many compliments excused himself, pointing out the abundant resources of the monastery, and adding, that he had learned from trustworthy persons that the monks exceeded the moderation suitable to their state, by their expensive dress and diet, and by their custom of never riding out without three or four mounted attendants ("cum equitaturis tribus vel quatuor").*

Even in the Cistercian monasteries the old fervent spirit seems to have been more than half extinguished. Great disorders arose in nearly all monasteries during the civil wars of the fifteenth century. In those of the Cistercians, few changes were more striking than the use of flesh-meat, in consequence of the precariousness or paucity of other supplies. As soon as the immediate pressure was removed, some efforts were made to restore the ancient practice. Neither chapters, however, nor applications to the Holy See, nor the exhortations of the Popes, were able to restore what had thus been lost.†

* Rymer, vol. iii. p. 210, 1740.
† Steven's Monast. vol. ii. p. 28, &c.

[A A.]

(*From page* 86.)

REPORT OF THE ROYAL COMMISSIONERS IN THE BEGINNING OF EDWARD VI.

"Our native country is greatly decayed, through the greediness of a few men in comparison; and by this ungodly means of gathering together goods by pulling down of towns and houses, which we ought all to lament, where there were in few years ten or twelve thousand people, there be now scarce four thousand; where there were a thousand, now scarce three hundred; and in many places, where there were very many able to defend our country from landing of our enemies, now almost none. Sheep and cattle that were ordained to be eaten of men, hath eaten up the men; not of their own nature, but by the help of men. Is it not a pityful case, that there should be so little charity among men? Is it not a sorrowful hearing, that one Englishman should be set to destroy his countryman? The places where poor men dwelt clearly destroyed; lands emproved to so great rents, or so excessive fines taken, that the poor husbandmen cannot live." *

[B.]

(*From page* 86.)

THE DISSOLUTION OF MONASTERIES.

From Tanner's Notitia (Nasmyth's edition, 1787), we learn the following particulars:—

The number of the lesser monasteries was three hundred and seventy-four, exclusively of the houses of the friars, the revenues of which were barely sufficient to keep the buildings in repair, and exclusively also of about fifty other lesser monasteries, the revenues of which are unknown.

The number of the greater monasteries was one hundred and eighty-six (Notitia, p. xxxvii). Of these, one or two counties, as Monmouthshire, did not possess a single one; but, on the other hand

* Strype's Mem. ii. Rep. of Orig. Q, p. 54. As it does not appear that the self-interest of the commissioners was at stake, we must suppose that the above account is sufficiently accurate; and that if new towns arose in other places, they were so few and so insignificant as to make no essential difference in the report.

in each of thirty-seven counties there was one at least; and in others there were several in each, whilst in Devonshire there were no fewer than nine, in Somersetshire eleven, and in Yorkshire twenty (Notit. xxxv).

The annual revenue of the lesser monasteries ... £29,702 1 10

„ „ greater „ ... £104,919 13 3

The Knights Hospitallers had forty-eight houses; the annual revenue of which was something more than £3,000 (Notit. xxxvii).

The White Friars or Carmelites had about forty houses (ib. Pref.). This order had been introduced from the Holy Land early in the thirteenth century. St. Simon Stock, the famous recluse of Kent, whose cell was a hollow oak, was the first Englishman who embraced this ancient institute. Becoming its general, he founded the confraternity of the Scapular. Nowhere did the order flourish so greatly as in England; and the ruin in which its houses were involved was, therefore, the more severely felt.

[B B.]

(*From page* 101.)

The charitable foundations established in Catholic times had almost always some reference to the souls in Purgatory. Hence it happened that, under pretence of attacking this devotion, the Protestants either utterly destroyed, or appropriated, at least for a time, almost every charitable institution. The monastic schools perished with the monasteries; but other schools there were, which became involved in a similar misfortune. How these had arisen in various parts of the country, independently of those of the monasteries, and how they were sometimes attached to the parish church to give it greater efficiency, as well as to pray for the souls of the founder, the following instance will sufficiently show:—

John Cardinal Kemp, the archbishop of Canterbury (A.D. 1452), seeing that his native parish of Wy was large and populous, needing "laborious diligence" to administer to the people "sacraments and sacramentals, and other ghostly food, and signally to counsel them, stir them, and comfort them," and seeing that the church was fair, and much more than sufficiently large for its "vicar and his parish priest," and moreover seeing that many of his ancestors were buried there,

procured the assent of the "abbot and convent" of Battle Abbey, to found and endow in the church at Wy, a "fellowship" of a master and six priests, two clerks, and two choristers; "and over that a master of grammar, that shall freely teach, without taking anything of them, all that would come to his teaching."*

Another institution that seldom escaped the general wreck, was that species of hospital which was intended for the shelter of the poor and the general purposes of education. Such an institution would now, almost as matter of course, be only a collection of alms-houses, having nothing in common except the receipt of the charity. Before the Reformation, the arrangement was very different. Thus, when the earl of Suffolk, in the fifteenth century, erected and endowed some almshouses, as they would now be called, he left, at the same time, an endowment for two priests; one to teach the poor inmates, thirteen in number, and the other to be a schoolmaster to "the children of the tenants" (Stowe, 388; H. VI.). In these institutions, the poor, the priest who had the care of them, and a chapel where the lamp of the blessed Sacrament was perpetually burning, were all, generally speaking, under one roof, and appear to have had a common table, and in all things a common rule. A remnant of this kind of institution may still be seen at Northampton, and probably in other places.

To this note upon charitable institutions, may be added an extract, which will give an idea of their great variety. When, soon after the Reformation, the monstrous abuses of funds for such purposes had become notorious, an act was passed to check them (43rd Eliz. c. 4). The following is part of its preamble, being, indeed, only a list of some of the chief objects of such institutions:—

"Whereas divers lands, tenements, rents, annuities, profits, hereditaments, goods, chattels, money, and stocks of money, have been, heretofore, given, limited, appointed, and assigned, as well by the queen's majesty and her progenitors, as by sundry other well-disposed persons, some for relief of aged, impotent, and poor people; some for maintenance of sick and maimed soldiers and mariners, schools of learning, free schools, and scholars in universities; some for repair of bridges, ports, havens, causeways, churches, sea-banks, and highways; some for education and preferment of orphans; some for or towards relief, stock, or maintenance for houses of correction; some for marriages of poor maids; some for supportation, aid, and help of young tradesmen, handicraftsmen, and persons decayed; and others for relief or redemption of prisoners or captives; and for aid or ease of any poor inhabi-

* Ap. Dugd. Monast. vol. iii. No. 24 (Battle Abbey), p. 254; Bohn's ed. 1846.

taunts concerning payments of fifteenths, setting out of soldiers, and other taxes; which nevertheless have not been employed according to the charitable intent," &c.

The confiscation, entire or partial, of many of these charitable institutions would of itself account for any amount of exasperation; but much more when added to the suppression of monasteries, the depopulating of many villages to secure extensive sheep-walks, the brand burnt into the face, and moreover the actual slavery, of every poor man who was reduced to beggary, and, lastly, the violence offered to the conscience, by forcing all Catholics, that is, the vast majority of the nation, to receive the new service. Such were some of the social as well as religious grievances that provoked the general insurrection in the reign of Edward VI.

[C.]

(*From page* 127.)

EXTRACT FROM STRYPE'S MEMORIALS OF ARCHBISHOP CRANMER.

[Page 551.] It is an account of Cranmer's death, by a contemporary. Strype thus introduces it:—

"Yet, because it is not convenient so briefly to pass over such a remarkable scene of his life, being his last appearance upon the stage of this world, I shall represent it in the words of a certain grave person unknown, but a Papist, who was an eye and ear witness, and related these matters, as it seems, very justly, in a letter from Oxon to his friend. Which is as followeth:—

"'But that I know for our great friendship, and long-continued love, you look even of duty that I should signify to you of the truth of such things as here chanceth among us; I would not at this time have written to you the unfortunate end, and doubtful tragedy, of T. C., late bishop of Canterbury: because I little pleasure take in beholding of such heavy sights. And, when they are once overpassed, I like not to rehearse them again; being but a renewing of my woe, and doubling my grief. For although his former life, and wretched end, deserves a greater misery (if any greater might have chanced than chanced unto him), yet, setting aside his offences to God and his country, and beholding the man without his faults, I think there was none that pitied not his case, and bewailed his fortune, and feared not his own chance, to see so noble a prelate, so grave a counsellor, of so long-continued honour, after so many dignities, in his old years to be

deprived of his estate, adjudged to die, and in so painful a death to end his life. I have no delight to increase it. Alas, it is too much of itself, that ever so heavy a case should betide to man, and man to deserve it.

"'But to come to the matter: on Saturday last, being the 21st of March, was his day appointed to die. And, because the morning was much rainy, the sermon appointed by Mr. Dr. Cole to be made at the stake, was made in St. Mary's Church: whither Dr. Cranmer was brought by the mayor, aldermen, and my Lord Williams. With whom came divers gentlemen of the shire, Sir T. A. Bridges, Sir John Browne, and others. Where was prepared, over against the pulpit, an high place for him, that all the people might see him. And, when he had ascended it, he kneeled down and prayed, weeping tenderly: which moved a great number to tears, that had conceived an assured hope of his conversion and repentance. * * *

[Page 554.] "'And I had almost forgotten to tell you, that Mr. Cole promised him, that he should be prayed for in every church in Oxford, and should have Mass and *Dirige* sung for him; and spake to all the priests present to say Mass for his soul.

"'When he had ended his sermon, he desired all the people to pray for him: Mr. Cranmer kneeling down with them, and praying for himself. I think there was never such a number so earnestly praying together. For they that hated him before now loved him for his conversion, and hope of continuance. They that loved him before could not suddenly hate him, having hope of his confession again of his fall. So love and hope increased devotion on every side.

"'I shall not need, for the time of sermon, to describe his behaviour, his sorrowful countenance, his heavy cheer, his face bedewed with tears; sometimes lifting his eyes to heaven in hope, sometimes casting them down to the earth for shame; to be brief, an image of sorrow: the dolor of his heart bursting out at his eyes in plenty of tears: retaining ever a quiet and grave behaviour. Which increased the pity in men's hearts, that they unfeignedly loved him, hoping it had been his repentance for his transgression and error. I shall not need, I say, to point it out unto you; you can much better imagine it yourself.

"'When praying was done, he stood up, and, having leave to speak, said, Good people, I had intended indeed to desire you to pray for me; which because Mr. Doctor hath desired, and you have done already, I thank you most heartily for it. * * *

[Page 557.] "'And now I come to the great thing that troubleth

my conscience more than any other thing that ever I said or did in my life: and that is, the setting abroad of writings contrary to the truth. Which here now I renounce and refuse, as things written with my hand, contrary to the truth which I thought in my heart, and writ for fear of death, and to save my life, if it might be: and that is, all such bills, which I have written or signed with mine own hand since my degradation: wherein I have written many things untrue. And forasmuch as my hand offended in writing contrary to my heart, therefore my hand shall first be punished: for if I may come to the fire, it shall be first burned. And as for the Pope, I refuse him, as Christ's enemy and Antichrist, with all his false doctrine.

"'And here, being admonished of his recantation and dissembling, he said, Alas, my lord, I have been a man that all my life loved plainness, and never dissembled till now against the truth; which I am most sorry for. He added hereunto, that, as for the Sacrament, he believed as he had taught in his book against the bishop of Winchester. And here he was suffered to speak no more.

"'So that his speech contained chiefly three points, love to God, love to the king, and love to the neighbour. In the which talk he held men very suspense, which all depended upon the conclusion: where he so far deceived all men's expectations, that, at the hearing thereat, they were much amazed; and let him go on a while, till my Lord Williams bade him play the Christian man, and remember himself. To whom he answered, That he so did: for now he spake truth.

"'Then he was carried away; and a great number, that did run to see him go so wickedly to his death, ran after him, exhorting him, while time was, to remember himself. And one Friar John, a godly and well learned man, all the way travelled with him to reduce him. But it would not be. What they said in particular I cannot tell, but the effect appeared in the end: for at the stake he professed, that he died in all such opinions as he had taught, and oft repented him of his recantation. Coming to the stake with a cheerful countenance and willing mind, he put off his garments with haste, and stood upright in his shirt: and a bachelor of divinity, named Elye, of Brazen Nose College, laboured to convert him to his former recantation, with the two Spanish friars. But when the friars saw his constancy, they said in Latin one to another, *Let us go from him; we ought not to be nigh him: for the devil is with him.* But the bachelor in divinity was more earnest with him: unto whom he answered, that, as concerning his recantation, he repented it right sore, because he knew it was against the truth; with other words more. Whereupon the Lord

Williams cried, Make short, make short. Then the bishop took certain of his friends by the hand. But the bachelor of divinity refused to take him by the hand, and blamed all others that so did, and said, he was sorry that ever he came in his company. And yet again he required him to agree to his former recantation. And the bishop answered (shewing his hand), This is the hand that wrote it, and therefore shall it suffer first punishment.

"'Fire being now put to him, he stretched out his right hand, and thrust it into the flame, and held it there a good space, before the fire came to any other part of his body; where his hand was seen of every man sensibly burning, crying with a loud voice, *This hand hath offended.* As soon as the fire got up, he was very soon dead, never stirring or crying all the while.

"'His patience in the torment, his courage in dying, if it had been taken either for the glory of God, the wealth of his country, or the testimony of truth, as it was for a pernicious error, and subversion of true religion, I could worthily have commended the example, and matched it with the fame of any father of antient time: but, seeing that not the death, but the cause and quarrel thereof, commendeth the sufferer, I cannot but much dispraise his obstinate stubbornness and sturdiness in dying, and specially in so evil a cause. Surely his death much grieved every man; but not after one sort. Some pitied to see his body so tormented with the fire raging upon the silly carcass, that counted not of the folly. Other, that passed not much of the body, lamented to see him spill his soul, wretchedly, without redemption, to be plagued for ever. His friends sorrowed for love; his enemies for pity; strangers for a common kind of humanity, whereby we are bound one to another. Thus I have enforced myself, for your sake, to discourse this heavy narration, contrary to my mind: and, being more than half weary, I make a short end, wishing you a quieter life, with less honour; and easier death, with more praise. The 23d of March.

"'Yours, J. A.'" *

* Ap. Strype's Memor. of Cran. vol. i. p. 551, &c.; Oxf. 1812, or p. 384 of older ed.

[D.]

(*From page* 139.)

THE DISSENSIONS OF THE PREACHERS OF THE NEW DOCTRINES.

The dissensions of these men, even in their exile, was not only a notorious fact, but is recorded in their own correspondence.

"They said," wrote Bale to Ashley, "that in the latter times should come mockers, liars, blasphemers, and fierce despisers. We have them, we have them, Master Ashley; we have them even from among ourselves: yea, they be at this present our elders, and their factious affinity.

"When we require to have common prayers, according to our English order, they tell us, that the magistrate will in no case suffer it: which is a most manifest lie. They mock the rehearsal of God's commandments, and of the epistles and gospels in our Communion, and say, they are misplaced; they blaspheme our Communion, calling it a Popish Mass, with other fierce despisings and cursed speakings. These mocks, and these blasphemies, with such like, they take for invincible theology. With these they build, with these they boast, with these they triumph, in erecting their church of the *purity*." *

"In senibus magis canis et theologis illud miror, quorum authoritas quum potissimum intercedere debebat ad concordiam, hi omnium maxime faces incendio subministrant. Perlongam hic texeram Iliada, si tabulam per singulos actus diducerem, si odia, convitia, sycophantias ac maledicentissimæ linguæ virulentias, suspiciones, captiones, commemorarem." †

For further elucidation of the character, writings, and general proceedings of the Reformers, see Maitland's Essays on the Reformation.

* Bale's letter from Basil to Ashley at Frankford, ap. Str. Mem. iii. Catal. of Orig. No. 39.

† Ib. No. 37 (John Fox to Peter Martyr concerning the troubles at Frankford).

[D D.]

(*From page* 286.)

REMARKS ON ST. WINEFRID.

No contemporary life of St. Winefrid exists. The two lives which are the ground of all succeeding accounts of this saint, were written in the beginning of the twelfth century, while she herself appears to have lived in the seventh century. Nearly all that is really known of her is, that she was placed under the care of St. Beuno, of North Wales; that having received the veil from his hands, she lived in a small nunnery near Holywell; and that fleeing to the Church from the wickedness of Prince Caradoc, she was gloriously martyred.

Her relics were afterwards translated to the abbey of Shrewsbury, one of the priors of which, in the twelfth century, wrote her life.

It would take a volume to narrate the wonderful cures wrought at Holywell and at the shrine of the saint in Shrewsbury Abbey. Father Oldcorne's cure, mentioned in the text, is not more striking nor better authenticated than a multitude of others. A few instances are stated by Butler, at the end of his Life of St. Winefrid. Milner's account of Winefrid White is well known. An attestation by eye-witnesses of a remarkable cure, is to be found at full length, in Dr. Oliver's recent work, "Collections," &c. regarding Cornwall, Devon, &c. 1857: Appendix to Part i. No. vi. p. 210.

[E E.]

(*From page* 326.)

Although the persecution was far less severe under Charles I. than under either James or Elizabeth, and although the fines levied on conviction appear to have been often mitigated, yet the arrests and trials of Catholics were almost incessant. In 1643, William Prynne collected and published by authority of parliament, several of the king's letters and other documents, in a book called "The Popish Royal Favourite." In this work (p. 15) occurs the following passage:—

"The conviction of recusants from 1 Caroli, in the twenty-nine English counties within the southern division.

		Anno Caroli about				Anno Caroli about	
In Bedford	until	14	90	In Leicester	until	16	420
„ Berks	„	14	360	„ Middlesex	„	16	1060
„ Bucks	„	14	310	„ Monmouth	„	14	1400
„ Cambridge	„	13	40	„ Norfolk	„	14	490
„ Cornwall	„	13	160	„ Northampton	„	9	230
„ Devon	„	13	200	„ Oxford	„	14	440
„ Dorset	„	14	210	„ Salop	„	12	560
„ Essex	„	12	190	„ Somerset	„	14	330
„ Gloucester	„	12	80	„ Sussex	„	12	950
„ Hartford	„	4	20	„ Suffolk	„	13	460
„ Huntingdon	„	14	50	„ Surrey	„	12	160
„ Hampshire	„	14	960	„ Wilts	„	14	160
„ Hereford	„	15	760	„ Warwick	„	12	1000
„ Kent	„	13	290	„ Worcester	„	13	540"

[F.]

(*From page* 343.)

It is not a mere surmise that the traditions of Cecil and Walsingham were still acted upon. Circumstances were indeed so far changed, that it was impossible to act upon them so inexorably as in the days of Elizabeth and her immediate successors; but the following brief and contemporary memoir shows that the tradition itself existed, and was occasionally acted upon. The memoir was written by Anthony Windsor, who died in 1697. It is to be found in Oliver's recent Collect. p. 207.

"Sir,—Being now in the seventy-fifth year of my age, and thinking it proper to leave you some memoirs of the transactions of my time, I shall in the first place set down as a key to all the rest, a remarkable passage that happened some time before the restoration of the late king, Charles II. In the time of Oliver's usurpation, the reputed delinquents and recusants were necessitated to endeavour to make their compositions as well as they could; and for that purpose to attend

upon the several committees, both at London and in the country, as their different circumstances required, and make what interest they could for the mitigation of the high impositions laid upon them. On this troublesome occasion, Sir William Pershall, a gentleman of my acquaintance, who had been cotemporary student and fellow-reveller with the great Bradshaw at Gray's Inn, and by that means had contracted a great friendship with him, found himself obliged to apply to him for assistance. Many years had intervened since they had lived together; but yet upon Sir William's first address to Bradshaw, he assured him of the continuance of *his* friendship, and that he would confirm it by any favours he could do him or any friend of his. And I have heard Sir William affirm it to the gentlemen, his friends, at the club or meeting then held in Hen and Chickens Court, near St. Dunstan's Church, in Fleet-street (where Sir William constantly resorted), that he had experienced his favour both to himself and others, and that he gave him freedom of access to him any time since upon his occasions. And I remember he told us that he had waited upon him once at his closet, in or near to the council-chamber; and being thus alone, Bradshaw, after his free and familiar way, asked him, 'Sir William, what do you think I am doing?'

"Sir William answered he could not guess, no otherwise than that he was busy about the affairs of his great employ.

"'*Sir*,' said Bradshaw, '*I am studying politics. They have made me President of their Council; and I am reading Mr. Secretary Cecil's instructions left them: and pray you, see how you Papists are to be dealt with. For this I assure you is the secretary's own hand*,' giving him a loose sheet of paper, out of many others. Sir William read it carefully; and, I remember, told us of the club, that the substance of it was:—

"That the ministry should by no means be ever induced to take off the penal laws; but that when they perceived that, by their connivance and forbearing to put them in execution, the Papists began to be too popular and agreeable both to their neighbours in the country and to their relations and friends at court, as by their moral and charitable way of living they would not fail to do, and even to be thought to deserve the privileges and freedom of other subjects, and not the severity of persecution merely for their conscience; then to obviate and allay this good opinion of their relations and neighbours, the ministry must be sure to fix *some odious design* upon them, which would never fail to be believed by the generality of the common people, and then they might put the penal laws in execution, to what degree

they should think necessary against them; and people would think them kind and favourable to let the Papists live. But they must never permit or suffer themselves to be prevailed with to take off the penal laws; but reserve them as a bridle to keep the Papists out of all public employ in this country, and to depress them, whenever they should think it necessary, or find them grow more numerous, or in greater favour and esteem with their neighbours.

"This, sir, I remember very well, was the substance of what Sir William told us he had read in that paper. And I give you this account of it the rather, because as I heard him speak it and attest it as a matter of fact and a real truth, so I have often reflected upon it, finding our modern state ministers pursuing the said method exactly. For upon the restauration of King Charles II., when the poor Catholics, to a man almost, able to bear arms, had either fought or suffered for his father, addressed his first parliament, and petitioned, that in consideration of what they had done and suffered in his service, and of their having been so signally instrumental (as it had pleased God to make them) in securing his then present majesty's person from falling into his enemies' hands, after the battle of Worcester, they might be favourably looked upon, and admitted into the rank and privileges of his other subjects, by removing those heavy penal laws so long kept hanging over their heads, and debarring them from all the privileges of their birthright, and even enjoyed by those that had been in that long rebellion against his father and himself; it was opposed by a great statesman, and could not be obtained. A toleration and connivance, however, was thought fit to be permitted them, with a cessation from the execution of those penal laws during their pleasure. And this the Catholics very contentedly acquiesced unto, till about the middle of King Charles II.'s reign, as being no ways ambitious of bearing any public offices. About that time the restless Presbyterian humour began again to work; and it was urged in parliament, that the exemption granted to Papists was a greater benefit and advantage than the rest of the dissenting subjects enjoyed, and therefore it was thought fit that they ought at least to bear a double share of the taxes. But the king, being well satisfied of the loyal principles and practices of his Catholic subjects, took off that pretence by setting forth his proclamation for a general toleration and indulgence to all his subjects in the exercise of their religion, that should not by their preaching and practices disturb the peace of the kingdom. But this gave so great a disgust to some of our principal ministers of state, that Prince Rupert and some of the king's chief court favourites were employed to solicit and

press him to recall that proclamation, and to suggest to him that it would be resented by his parliament at their next session; that they would give him no aids nor taxes till he had recalled it, and perhaps would vote him incapable of doing it without them. This moved the king, whose profuse expenses made him always wanting of money, to recall the proclamation; and thereby he encouraged our discontented cunning statesmen, and gave them occasion to forge and foment that execrable pretented Popish plot which was set on foot soon after," &c.

[F F.]

(*From page* 354.)

The extremes into which clever men like Dr. Holden could sometimes plunge, as exemplified in the following petition, is a warning too striking to be altogether overlooked. It is to be found in the Appendix to Plowden's Remarks on Panzani, p. 380.

" Scriptum ab eximio Domino Henrico Holdeno, S. T. Doctore Sorbonico, exhibitum Parlamento Anglicano anno Domini 1647, pro regimine Catholicorum Angliæ.

" Si placuerit Parlamento libertatem facere, ut Catholici Romani in regno quiete vivant, placeat illi pariter a vero Catholico hoc consilium admittere, in sui majorem et meliorem securitatem.

" Primo, nullus externus rex aut status pro eis intercedat, nec se in componendis Catholicorum rebus immisceat; sed videant Catholici hanc sibi a Parlamento libertatem concedi suâ sponte et merâ erga eos benevolentiâ.

" Secundo, jusjurandum hoc impressum et his annexum universaliter ab omnibus Catholicis cujuscunque professionis fiat; et si quis ecclesiasticus aut sæcularis, laicus aut religiosus, illud recuset, rogetur is, ut a regno se subtrahat, tanquam membrum non idoneum reipublicæ, prout res in præsentia se habent.

" Tertio, habeant Catholici, vel potius obligentur habere, sex vel octo episcopos plus minus, per quos gubernentur.

" Hi episcopi erunt (prout omnes alii ordinarii episcopi sunt), omnium Catholicorum sententia, Apostolorum successores, habentes autoritatem suam immediate ab ipsomet Christo Jesu, et consequenter independentem ab omni alia autoritate spirituali quacunque, etiam ipsius Papæ. Nam quamvis omnes episcopi teneantur agnoscere Papam tanquam

caput suum, vel primum pastorem, ille tamen non potest iis ullum præceptum imponere cujuscunque naturæ, nisi ipsi et respublica, in qua degunt, judicent expedire; et hæc erat olim praxis Catholicorum in Anglia et nunc est in Gallia, et in omni alio regno et statu Catholico.

" Omnis clerus, seu omnes ecclesiastici, sive sint sæculares, sive regulares, pendeant ab his episcopis et renuntiare cogantur omni immediatæ dependentiæ ab alio quocunque extra regnum, eoque maximè, quia multi regulares prætendunt se per Papam eximi ab omni ordinaria potestate et jurisdictione episcoporum, et immediate subjici Papæ vel ordinis generali alienigenæ, et apud exteras nationes degenti. Quare omnes sacerdotes, tam sæculares quam regulares, jurejurando teneantur nullam exercere jurisdictionem, ecclesiasticam functionem, spiritualem autoritatem, nisi ab ipsis episcopis acceptam et derivatam, et eorundem permissu. Quibus quicunque resisterint aut prætenderint se immediate pendere ab externo aliquo prælato aut potestate quacunque, rogetur ut e regno se subtrahant, tanquam membra non idonea huic reipublicæ, prout res in præsentia se habent.

" Omnes Catholici laici totius regni (juxta omnium Catholicorum sententiam) erunt vere et per Christi institutionem subditi istis episcopis in omni re spirituali, et consequenter hi episcopi aliquo modo teneri poterunt respondere pro criminibus a suis subditis commissis (si quæ fuerint) contra statum. Et ne episcopi hi nimium suam autoritatem extendant, præsertim in rebus quæ faciunt ad gubernationem temporalem, ut in testamentorum probationibus, piorum legatorum dispositione, in causis matrimonialibus judicandis,* etc., facile erit jurisdictionem coercere in similibus, prout expedire videbitur in rerum particularium discussione.

" Quia vero Jesuitæ videntur periculosum corpus, et ab omni statu Christiano acatholico habentur maxime factiosi, si vel illi, vel ullus regularis ordo recusaverit impressum hoc, et hisce annexum jusjurandum facere, vel se subjicere episcopis ut supra, habeantur membra non idonea reipublicæ, ut nunc se res habent; et ideo rogentur ut e regno se subtrahant, non religionis causa, sed suspicionis, quam de ipsis status habere poterit; cui quidem rei reliqui Catholici se minime opponent, prout se non opposuerunt Venetiis, et in aliis Catholicis statibus, multo minus in regno acatholico."

* This proposition has been condemned by Pius IX.

[G.]

(*From page* 360.)

OATH OF ALLEGIANCE UNDER WILLIAM AND MARY.

"I, A. B., Do sincerely Promise and Swear that I will be Faithful and bear true Allegiance to Their Majesties King William and Queen Mary. So help me God.

"I, A. B., Do Swear that I do from my Heart Abhor, Detest, and Abjure as Impious and Heretical that damnable Doctrine and Position, That Princes Excommunicated or Deprived by the Pope or any Authority of the See of Rome may be Deposed or Murdered by their Subjects or any other whatsoever. And I do Declare that no Foreign Prince, Person, Prelate, State, or Potentate hath or ought to have any Power, Jurisdiction, Superiority, Pre-eminence, or Authority, Ecclesiastical or Spiritual, within this Realm. So help me God." *

[G G.]

(*From page* 376.)

The following account, extracted from Barnard's Life of Challoner, will give some further insight into Payne's prosecutions; and will prove how completely the interpretation of certain laws depends upon the temper of the times, and the personal character of the judge. Speaking of Payne, Barnard thus continues:—

"But though he withdrew the prosecutions against Dr. Challoner, and the other five persons who were indicted at the same time with him, and did not molest them any more: yet he carried on the prosecutions against the others with unremitted vehemence. He had indicted Mr. John Baptist Malony, who was brought to his trial at Croydon, in Surrey, and being convicted of having exercised the functions of a priest of the Church of Rome, was sentenced to perpetual imprisonment, and was accordingly imprisoned in the New Gaol, Southwark, but afterwards, upon his petition, was removed to the King's Bench. He had also indicted Messrs. James Dillon, Anthony

* 1 Gul. & Mar. c. 1.

Barnewall, James Webb, and Hyacintho de Magallaens, all whom he brought to their trial in the Court of King's Bench at Westminster; but as he could not prove that any of them were priests, or that the functions which he saw them perform were not such as might be performed by persons who were not in priest's orders, they were all acquitted.

"On the trial of Mr. James Webb, which was brought on, on Saturday, June 25th, 1768, before the Right Honourable William Earl Mansfield, Lord Chief Justice of the Court of King's Bench, at Westminster: after all the evidence for the Crown were examined, *Counsellor Mansfield* stood up in behalf of Mr. Webb, and said:—

"'My Lord, I humbly submit to your lordship's judgment the meaning of the statutes (11 and 12 of William III.) on which the defendant is indicted; but it appears to me very manifest, that before anything capital can be proved against him, he must first be convicted of being a priest. For the Act says, "*Whosoever shall apprehend a Popish bishop, priest, or Jesuit, and convict;*" therefore, with submission to your lordship's judgment, it is to no purpose what they have seen him do, or heard him say, so long as there are no evident proofs of his being a priest.'

"*Sir Fletcher Norton, on behalf of the Plaintiff.*—'My Lord, I beg leave to make a reply. If this is the meaning of the statute, it will be impossible to prove any man a priest. We shall be obliged to go abroad into their colleges and seminaries, and even to the very place where they were ordained, and to the bishops that ordained them, to see them ordained, and perhaps to Rome, and even to the Pope himself, before we can prove them to be priests. Therefore, with submission to your lordship's judgment, this could never be the intent of the legislators.'

"*Counsellor Bishop.*—'My Lord, I proposed to speak upon this subject; but since Sir Fletcher Norton has done it much better than I can pretend to, I only beg leave to add, that it is my opinion the legislators, in making this statute, never designed that he should first be convicted of being a priest, before anything could be brought against him for exercising priestly functions.'

"*Lord Mansfield.*—'I have considered in my own mind the whole evidence. And as for the meaning of those statutes, I own before that affair happened in Surrey I had not thoroughly examined them. But since that time all the twelve judges have consulted upon them, and we have all agreed in opinion that the statutes are so worded, that in order to convict a man upon those statutes *it is necessary that he be*

first proved to be a priest: and, secondly, *that it be proved he has said Mass.*'

"*Counsellor Cox, for the Defendant.*—'Gentlemen of the jury, you must have observed that the chief evidence against J. Webb is this Payne, who has been all his life a common informer, who makes it his business to make people miserable. Some time he used to go about on Sundays, among those poor women who sell gingerbread-nuts, and such-like things, to get a trifle to buy bread for their poor starving children at home; since by their hard labour all the week they were not able to raise sufficient to make a Sunday's dinner. These poor people he took up, fined, and distressed them, and their poor innocent children, in the most inhuman and barbarous manner imaginable. As I often had opportunities of speaking to Payne on those occasions, I asked him how he could be so cruel? He said they deserved it, because they profaned the Lord's-day. Next he attacked another set of people still more innocent. I mean the poor beggars: these also he took up, sent them to Bridewell, and such-like places. I asked him why he did this? Because, said he, they ought to go to church and say their prayers. Thus he has gone on many years, with several other poor innocent people; watching all opportunities to put them in trouble, to distress the distressed, and make them still more miserable. What can you think of such a man, who makes it his whole employment to go about from place to place, watching all opportunities to ruin his fellow-creatures? This cannot be the spirit of the Protestant religion, which teaches nothing but mildness and clemency. No, gentlemen of the jury, this is the province of the very devil himself, *who goeth about like a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour.* Payne, therefore, must be instigated by him to such practices, not by religion, since he imitates the devil to ruin mankind. I mentioned those things that you may judge by the next step he takes, whether Payne had the sanctification of the Sabbath at heart, or not? On the Lord's-day he went to Virginia Street, and there found Mr. Webb saying his prayers —praying to the same God that we pray to—praising God in the religion he was brought up to, and which, from his education, he always believed to be right. What does Payne do now? Instead of being edified in seeing the Lord's-day sanctified, and God praised by people saying their prayers, he drags the defendant from the altar of God, to have him tried before you, whether such a crime does not deserve perpetual imprisonment? Gentlemen, you heard the evidence called, and what they have sworn to. As for all the rest, except Payne, it is manifest they have said nothing to the purpose. One said he heard

the defendant preach. Another said he saw him sprinkle with holy water. Another, that he said some prayers to the Virgin Mary in English, and the people said *Pray for us.* Another, that he saw him with some vestments on, and when he began to pray, he did not know what he said, but that all the people kneeled down; but when he stood up, the people, suspecting him to be a spy, turned him out. Now, gentlemen, all this makes nothing against the defendant, because all these things might be done by a person who is not a priest. A deacon in their religion can even administer the Sacraments; and they frequently preach; and as for sprinkling with holy water, or saying some prayers in English, any one might do these things: so that all the evidence they have given amounts to nothing at all; nor do they in the least prove that he is either a priest or that he said Mass; and consequently make nothing against the defendant. Wherefore, gentlemen, you see this common informer, Payne, is the only person who has made any shadow of evidence against him: he, indeed, has sworn that he heard him say Mass, and he pretends to prove it by saying that he saw him dressed up in vestments, with a cross on his back: that he looked over a coalheaver's shoulders who had a Prayer-book with the mass in Latin and English: that he often had been at the ambassadors' chapels, and seen them say Mass there; and that J. Webb did the same as they did. Gentlemen, you will be pleased to observe that seeing a person in vestments is no proof at all that he is a priest: deacons use vestments; and even in the Greek Church, they have vestments not unlike those used by the Roman Catholics. Nay, in Westminster Abbey we have several old vestments, that for anything I know may be the very same that were formerly used by the Roman Catholics: so this proves nothing at all. In the next place, as for Payne's saying that he looked over the coalheaver's shoulder and read his book, and saw how the defendant went on, it does not prove that he said the whole Mass. Now, if he did not say the whole Mass, but only a part of it, it cannot be said that he said Mass. As for example, in our religion, there are some things in our service that I know many dislike—I am not ashamed to specify the Athanasian Creed. Now if it should be enacted, that whoever said that creed in time of divine service should be severely fined, and a minister should begin and stop before he finished the creed, no one could swear that he had said the creed, and consequently the minister could not be fined. Just so then if Mr. Webb left out any part of the Mass, it cannot be said that he said Mass, and consequently he cannot be convicted of saying Mass; for can you imagine that if Mr. Webb saw Payne there, that he would

not leave out some part of it, knowing him to be a common informer? And if he left out ever so little, it cannot be said that he said Mass. Next, Payne says that he was often at the ambassadors' chapels, and that the defendant did the same as he saw there. What is that to the purpose? There are a great many different services in the Church of Rome, and these performed with vestments, candles, &c. For example, there is one part of their service which they call Matins, another Vespers, and many others; therefore it might be some of these and not Mass that he was about. In all which you may see what a busy worthless fellow this Payne is, in going about from place to place to qualify himself to be an informer, and to trouble and distress poor innocent people. As for my part, gentlemen, it is a singular pleasure to me to defend such innocent people against such a villain, and which I am, and shall always be, ready to do. It cannot be zeal that prompts Payne to enforce these laws: for it cannot be imagined that our fathers and grandfathers were not so zealous for the laws of England, and as good Protestants, as ever Payne was, and yet they never once thought of enforcing them, notwithstanding it is now several generations since they were first made. No, gentlemen, it is money, and that alone, that makes Payne become informer. He has got one hundred pounds already by informing, and now sets no bounds to his avarice; he has left off his carpenter's trade to become informer.'

"*Payne.*—'I deny it; I'll prove that false. I have several men at work at this time.'

"*Lord Mansfield.*—'Silence, silence, Payne,—hold your tongue.'

"*Counsellor Cox.*—'Moreover, gentlemen of the jury, you must know that there are two sorts of Roman Catholics; one who hold that the Pope has supreme power over all kings and potentates. Now it is against those that all those penal laws are designed, as you shall hear [*He quotes some of the laws*]. See here, gentlemen; these laws do not condemn all Papists, but only those who hold this supreme power in the Pope. Now Payne has not accused the defendant of ever acknowledging such power in the Pope; and consequently these laws were never designed against anything the defendant had done, unless it could be first proved that he had held this power in the Pope. And you are all sensible that none of the evidence has accused him of this, nor given him the least hints of it. Hence, gentlemen, you see, in the first place, that it is not evident that the defendant has said Mass; these laws do not condemn him merely on that account. Moreover, if it could be proved that he has said Mass, this does not prove him to be a priest, as I will show you from the following remarkable example:—

In the reign of Queen Elizabeth, there was a noted lawyer whose name was Plowden, and being a Roman Catholic he had many enemies in the country where he lived; and you must know there was a Payne amongst them. What did they do, but contrive to have Mass said, so that Mr. Plowden might be present. There was a priest, altar, vestments, candles, and everything necessary. Mr. Plowden very innocently went to hear Mass, but it was scarce over, but he was arrested with a warrant for hearing Mass, and was actually tried for it. The evidence appeared against him, and swore positively that they saw Mr. Plowden hear Mass. At last the priest himself appeared against him, and swore that Mr. Plowden heard Mass, for that he himself had said Mass, and that he saw Mr. Plowden there. Pray, says Mr. Plowden, let me ask you a question: Are you a priest? No; replied the other. Oh! then, said Mr. Plowden, the case is altered,—no priest, no Mass. Now, gentlemen, I am fully persuaded when you have considered all these things, you will easily acquit the defendant. For you must not look upon this affair as a matter of small importance, that is to say, where the fine is trifling; for the punishment, if convicted, is no less than perpetual imprisonment; and, therefore, in all such cases, nothing ought to cast a man but most clear and incontestable evidence. And as you have none such in the case before you, I rest satisfied that you will pronounce my client not guilty.'

"*Lord Mansfield.*—'Gentlemen of the jury, the material articles of this trial may be reduced to two heads. First, whether or no the defendant is a priest? And, secondly, whether or no he has said Mass? For I look upon the Mass as the only material charge in this trial, for that is properly the only act they alledge which is peculiar to the Papist clergy. As for those other things they have sworn they saw him do, they are nothing but what might be done by any one; at most they are no proofs that he is a priest. By the statute of Queen Elizabeth, 27, c. 2, it is high treason for any man who is proved to be a priest to breathe in this kingdom. Another statute was made afterwards more mild, that only imposed a fine and short imprisonment. But in examining those statutes, we have all agreed, that is, all the twelve judges have agreed, that "*Before any man can be proceeded against, so as to convict him, it is first necessary that he be proved to be a priest:*" for the statutes say, "If any one apprehends a Popish bishop, priest, or Jesuit, and convict him of saying Mass." So that it is not sufficient to convict a person on those statutes for saying Mass, unless he is first proved to be a priest; therefore the issue of the whole does not depend upon the saying Mass. Wherefore I shall leave it to

your consideration, whether the evidence given of his saying Mass be a sufficient argument to prove him to be a priest? You will be pleased to observe, that there is but one evidence to prove it. Payne is the only man who has sworn that he has said Mass. And this Payne is a very illiterate man; knows nothing of Latin, the language in which Mass is said; and, moreover, he is an evidence in his own cause, because, if Payne convicts him, he is intitled to a hundred pounds reward. No one ought to be an evidence in his own cause, though this is sometimes allowed of, as in cases of highwaymen, and the like; however, it is a consideration that I need not take notice of, as he is the only evidence. For several others were called, and not one of them would venture to swear that they saw James Webb say Mass. One swore he saw him sprinkle with holy water. Another, that he said some prayers to the Virgin Mary in English. Another, that he heard him preach. And being asked what he preached about, he said, he taught the people that good works were necessary for salvation; and he looked upon that not to be the doctrine of the Protestant religion. Gentlemen, I will leave that to your consideration. In short, none of those evidence are anything to the case in question. As for preaching, laymen often perform that; at least a deacon may do it in the Church of Rome. A deacon may even administer the Sacraments, and perform a great many of their services; and we do not know but that he may elevate the Host. At least I do not know but he may, and I am persuaded you know nothing about it. Now if a deacon may perform all those things Payne saw the defendant do, they are no proofs that he is a priest. Therefore I propose to give it up to the jury in this light, and shall consider the saying Mass as a material charge, which I shall leave to their consideration, whether the evidence of his Mass sufficiently proves him first of all to be a priest, and, secondly, whether it proves that he has said Mass. You will be pleased to observe, that the charge before you is quite different from that which lately happened in Surrey; there the defendant confessed himself to be a priest.'

"*Sir Fletcher Norton.*—'My lord, we had his own handwriting, which said I am a priest of such an order.'

"*Lord Mansfield.*—'I did not know that. I thought he had only acknowledged it. That was still stronger against him. But, gentlemen, you will be pleased to observe that nothing of this appears against Mr. Webb. He has neither owned it, nor has anything been produced to prove it, as there are no proofs of his ordination, which must be before he can be proved to be a priest. Therefore, if it should be proved that he has said Mass, this will not convict him of being

a priest; as appears evidently from the example his counsel has brought, of a person who had no ordination at all, and yet said Mass. But as that person was not a priest, and therefore could not be condemned by those statutes, so neither can the defendant before there are sufficient proofs of his ordination.

" 'This Payne having got a hundred pounds since the conviction of that man in Surrey, and being now in hopes of more money, swears positively that the defendant said Mass. And you see what pains he has taken, running here and there, sometimes to the ambassadors' to see how they performed there, and then stealing in privately where he thought he might lay an information to get another hundred pounds. Though, according to the penal statutes of Queen Elizabeth, which are still in force, it is high treason for a priest to come into England; yet the informer is intitled to no reward. There are three statutes against priests. The first is that of Queen Elizabeth, 27, c. 2, which makes it high treason for them to come into England: but Payne has not indicted him upon that statute; because, if he had been convicted, he would have had no reward. There was another made afterwards, enacting, that if a priest was convicted of saying Mass, he was to forfeit two hundred marks, and suffer one year's imprisonment. But neither does Payne go upon this statute, for here there is no reward for the informer. The third was made in King William's reign, 11 and 12, c. 4, soon after the Revolution. This is the statute Payne aims at, because here is one hundred pounds the county is to pay to him if he can convict the defendant.

" 'In the beginning of the Protestant religion, in order to establish it, they thought it in some manner necessary to enact those penal laws; for then the Pope had great power, and they thought they could not take too effectual means to prevent him exercising any part of it in these dominions. And the Jesuits were then a very formidable body, and apprehending great danger from them, knowing their close connections with the Pope, the penal laws were chiefly designed against them. But now the case is quite altered. The Pope has very little power, which seems to grow less and less daily. As for the Jesuits, they are now banished out of most kingdoms in Europe, so that there is nothing to fear from either of these quarters, and consequently no necessity of enforcing these laws. Neither was it ever the design of the legislators to have these laws enforced by every common informer, but only at proper times and seasons when they saw a necessity for it, and by proper persons appointed by themselves for that purpose. And, yet more properly speaking, they were never designed to be enforced

at all, but were only made *in terrorem*. Now when you have considered all these things, and reflected that there is only one evidence, only Payne, and that all he has sworn to is only saying Mass, I shall leave it to your consideration whether the evidence given by this one only witness be sufficient to convict James Webb, first, of his being a priest, and, secondly, of his exercising priestly functions; that is, whether or no he has said Mass? For I look upon that as the only material thing he is charged with, and the only thing that comes under your consideration. But take notice, if you bring him in guilty the punishment is very severe, a dreadful punishment indeed! Nothing less than a perpetual imprisonment. So that if you have the least doubt, you ought by no means to bring him in guilty. Nothing but the clearest evidence ought to condemn a man to such a grievous punishment. Be pleased therefore to consult together, and when you have agreed, bring in the verdict *Acquitted*.'

"After the trial of Mr. Webb was finished, that of Mr. Hyacintho de Magallaens was brought on; but as the evidence had nothing to alledge against him but what they had before alledged against Mr. Webb, he was also acquitted." *

[H.]

(*From page* 377.)

THE FIRST ACT OF TOLERATION OF CATHOLICS, AND ITS ACCOMPANYING OATH OF ALLEGIANCE.

The very preamble of this Act shows how different was the tone of parliament now from that of the two previous centuries. "Whereas," it began, it is expedient to repeal certain provisions in the Act of King William III. "for the further preventing of the growth of Popery," be it enacted, it continued, that except in suits actually pending, so much of the said Act is hereby repealed as relates to the "taking or prosecuting of Popish bishops, priests, or Jesuits," or to the subjecting to perpetual imprisonment those Catholics that board or educate youth; or to the disabling of Catholics from inheriting, or devising, or purchasing lands and tenements, and making void all "other interests or profits whatsoever out of lands." This concession, however, was made only in favour of those who had taken the following oath:—

"I, A. B., do sincerely promise and swear, that I will be faithful and

* Barnard's Challoner, pp. 165—182.

bear true allegiance to his majesty King George III., and him will defend to the utmost of my power, against all conspiracies and attempts whatever that shall be made against his person, crown, or dignity; and I will do my utmost endeavour to disclose and make known to his majesty, his heirs and successors, all treasons and traitorous conspiracies which may be formed against him or them; and I do faithfully promise to maintain, support, and defend, to the utmost of my power, the succession of the crown in his majesty's family, against any person or persons whatsoever; hereby utterly renouncing and abjuring any obedience or allegiance unto the person taking upon himself the style and title of *Prince of Wales*, in the lifetime of his father, and who, since his death, is said to have assumed the style and title of *King of Great Britain*, by the name of *Charles the Third*, and to any other person claiming or pretending a right to the crown of these realms; and I do swear, that I do reject and detest as an unchristian and impious position, that it is lawful to murder or destroy any person or persons whatsoever, for or under pretence of their being heretics; and also that unchristian and impious principle, that no faith is to be kept with heretics. I further declare, that it is no article of my faith, and that I do renounce, reject, and abjure the opinion, that princes excommunicated by the Pope and council, or by any authority of the See of Rome, or by any authority whatsoever, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or any person whatsoever. And I do declare, that I do not believe that the Pope of *Rome*, or any other foreign prince, prelate, state, or potentate, hath, or ought to have, any temporal or civil jurisdiction, power, superiority, or pre-eminence, directly or indirectly, within this realm." *

[I.]

(*From page* 385.)

The following account of the state of Catholics during the riots of '80 is narrated by Barnard, Dr. Challoner's biographer. The portions of it that describe the general nature of the riots, are fully corroborated by other contemporary accounts, such as the Memoirs of Wraxall and Romilly, the newspapers of the time, &c. :—

"This anguish all the Catholicks in England, but more particularly those of London and its neighbouring villages, laboured under from the

* Statutes at Large, 18 Geo. III. c. 60.

moment of the commencement of the riots, till they were quelled by the exertion of the military power. And their anxieties were daily, nay hourly, renewed and encreased, partly by the intelligence brought to them from time to time by their friends and friendly neighbours, that their houses were marked for destruction: and partly by different bodies of the rioters themselves, who, going to destroy the house of some other of the Catholicks, threatened them also with a speedy visit for the same purpose. This drove them to the utmost degree of distress. Almost all the Catholicks packed up their money, plate, and other most valuable and portable moveables, and several of them committed them to the care of Protestant friends in whom they could confide, and who offered their service to secure such things as in their conveyance could be concealed from the notice of the rioters: but many others, being refused that protection by several to whom they applied, were obliged to carry their little bundles with them; abandoned their habitations, and the rest of their property to the fate that awaited it, and wandered about in the roads and fields, without knowing whither to go to for relief and shelter, and were in continual dread of being plundered of what they carried with them, either by rioters or footpad robbers.

"Notwithstanding there were many Protestants who wished well to the Catholicks in general, and to their Catholick neighbours in particular; yet the formidable appearance of the bodies of rioters, the devastation they had already made, and the unremitting cry of *No Popery*, struck them with such a panick, that everything that belonged to a Catholick, or came from a Catholick house, seemed to them as if it had been infected with the plague; and they were no less afraid of receiving it into their houses than if it really had been infected. And, indeed, there was some reason for these their fears: for as the rioters knew that the Catholicks would naturally endeavour to abscond and save their property, and they saw that they were actually conveying away their goods, they sent spies to watch to what houses they were carried, and then threatened destruction to these houses wherein they were received.

"Though I have here given an account of the proceedings of the rioters only in London: and that only inasmuch as they related to the Catholicks; yet the insurrection itself was general, and throughout all England. A Catholick chapel was burnt at Bath, and another at Hull. And though I have not heard of any more real destruction of the property of Catholicks in England (because the rioters in the country seemed to wait the events of the riots in London, before they should begin their own depredations), yet they went to all the Catho-

licks in the country, and threatened them with the like destruction: in consequence of which threats, they experienced all the uneasiness, all the anxiety, and every affliction which their brethren in London experienced, except that which resulted from the actual burning of their houses and effects.

"These riots, begun and carried on under pretence of religion, and threatening destruction to the Catholicks, gave great affliction to this venerable prelate (Dr. Challoner). For though Divine Providence preserved both his person from insults, and his little property from falling into the hands of the rioters: yet he had a copious share of suffering in this tumultuous time. The violent proceedings of the rioters, and the burning of so many chapels in so short a space of time, and the utter impossibility of preaching the Word of God and administering the Sacraments to the faithful, which was the necessary consequence of that catastrophe, seemed now, more than ever, to threaten the utter extirpation of the Catholick religion out of these kingdoms. And as he entertained a paternal affection for each one of his flock, the intelligence which he received of the loss which each one sustained, and the distress to which they were driven, cut him to the heart. On Friday, the second of June, about eight o'clock at night, after he was in bed, news was brought to his house that the rioters had set fire to the Sardinian ambassador's chapel, at Lincoln's Inn Fields, and that they intended presently, after they should have compleated the destruction of that chapel, to come and seize his person, and burn his house. His chaplains therefore went to him, awaked him out of his sleep, and without immediately letting him know all the mischief that was done, only acquainted him that the mobs were encreasing, that some mischief had been done, that everybody was in dread, and therefore they begged he would get up and remove to the house of some friend, where he might remain in safety, in case they should come to his house to attempt anything against his person. He for some time refused, alledging his confidence in the goodness and the protection of God. But they insisted that he should, and at length he yielded to their importunities, and for that night went to the house of a friend not far off, and the next day was conveyed to the country-house of a gentleman a few miles distant from London.

"Here he continued almost uninterruptedly occupied in prayer, offering himself to suffer whatsoever the Divine Providence should be pleased to ordain, recommending his flock to the mercy and protection of the Almighty, beseeching Him to deliver and preserve them from the hands of their enemies, and restore them again to a state of peace and

tranquillity. The gentleman at whose house he was, came every day to London to enquire into the state of affairs, and at his return at night related to Dr. Challoner what he had seen, and the accounts he had heard of the destruction and burning of chapels, the houses and property of several individuals: each new account of which renewed and augmented his affliction, and compassion for the sufferers. This gentleman found that on Monday, June 5, the rioters had been at his own house in town, but by the interposition of his friends and neighbours, they had been prevailed upon to depart without doing him any material injury: but that on Tuesday they had returned again, and threatened to burn his house and all his property, amounting to many thousand pounds; and that after they should have destroyed his town-house, they would go and in like manner destroy his house in the country. However, they then also were prevailed upon to depart, without putting their threats in execution. But these threats put him under great apprehensions and uneasiness, both for his own property and the person of his guest. He therefore represented to Dr. Challoner the danger he was in while he continued in his house, which was marked out for, and repeatedly threatened with, destruction; and requested that he would consent to be removed farther into the country, and consequently, as he hoped, more out of the way of danger. Dr. Challoner agreed to the proposal, packed up what few things he had with him, and resolved to set out on Wednesday in the afternoon, for the house of an other friend, farther off from London. Dinner being finished about half-past one o'clock, the coach was ordered to be got ready to convey him away; and Dr. Challoner retired to his apartment, that before his departure he might again recommend himself and his flock to the care and protection of Almighty God. He continued in prayer for the space of about an hour, the coach was waiting at the door, and the family were under some uneasiness, lest, during his delay, the rioters should come and seize his person. At length he came down, and instead of going into the coach, as it was imagined he would, he went and set himself down in the parlour; and after a few moments' pause, told the family that '*he who dwells in the help of the Most High, shall abide under the protection of the God of Heaven;* that whosoever is under His protection, is equally safe in every place: that consequently he was as safe where he was as he should be in any other place; and therefore he had changed his mind and would not depart; *and that the master of the house might lay aside his fears; for he was certain that no harm would happen either to his country-house or to his town-house.*'

"His resolute adherence to this declaration induced the master of the house to set out immediately for London, to see how matters went on. He found everything in a state of the utmost confusion: and when he departed from his house, expected that he should never more see it standing; such were the threats that had been denounced against him. On returning to his country-house that same evening, about four miles from London he met a large body of soldiers, marching in all haste to London, and addressing himself to the officer who commanded them, said to him: 'Sir, I am very glad to see you use so much diligence to succour an innocent and harmless people; but I am afraid that your arrival will be too late to succour me; because I imagine that my house and all my property in town is by this time in flames: as you may perceive from this place, that several places are at this instant on fire in London.' The officer very courteously replied, 'That he would make all possible haste, and afford his house all the protection that was in his power.' They took leave of each other; the gentleman returned to his family in the country, and related to them all that he had seen and heard, and still entertained great apprehensions for the fate of his town-house, till next morning, when news was brought them that the exertions of the military had quelled the riot, dispersed the rioters, and that peace and good order was now again re-established. Soon after which the gentleman went to London, and found the declaration of Dr. Challoner verified, that no harm had been done by the rioters to his house in town, notwithstanding their repeated threats to destroy it."*

[K.]

(*From page* 392.)

DE POTESTATE COMMUNITATI ECCLESIÆ ATTRIBUTA, UT PER HANC PASTORIBUS COMMUNICETUR.

Epist. Convoc.

II. Propositio, quæ statuit "potestatem a Deo datam Ecclesiæ, ut communicaretur pastoribus, qui sunt ejus ministri pro salute animarum."

Sic intellecta, ut a communitate fidelium in pastores derivetur ecclesiastici ministerii, ac regiminis potestas:—Hæretica.

* Barn.'s Chall. pp. 234—241.

DE CAPITIS MINISTERIALIS DENOMINATIONE ROMANO PONTIFICI ATTRIBUTA.

Decr. de Fide, § 8.

III. Insuper, quæ statuit "Romanum Pontificem esse caput ministeriale."

Sic explicata, ut Romanus Pontifex non a Christo in persona B. Petri, sed ab Ecclesia potestatem ministerii accipiat, qua velut Petri successor, verus Christi Vicarius, ac totius Ecclesiæ caput poliet in universa Ecclesia :—Hæretica.

[L.]

(*From page* 404.)

Of the danger of a division of the Catholics into two parties, each having chapels of its own, from which its opponents would be excluded, some idea may be formed, not only from the new designation, but from the following clause which was drawn up, says Charles Butler, by some Protestant "of very high rank," and at his suggestion was adopted by the Committee. It is to be found amongst the answers of Charles Butler, at the end of "An Appeal to the Catholics of England, by the Catholic Clergy of the County of Stafford:" 1792. As it is there collated with a clause in the Toleration Act in favour of Dissenters, and as this collation itself is a remarkable commentary, both are here given as they stand in the above pamphlet (pp. 27—29).

"Copy of the 12th clause in the 1st of William and Mary, c. 18.—Ruffhead's Statutes, 3 vol. p. 426.

"And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that every justice of the peace may, at any time hereafter, require any person that goes to any meeting, for exercise of religion, to make and subscribe the declaration aforesaid,*

"Copy of the clause above referred to, in the Catholic bill.

"And be it further enacted, that every justice of the peace may, at any time hereafter, require any person that goes to any place of congregation or meeting for exercise of religion certified and registered under this act, to take and

* "The declaration here referred to is the oath prescribed by the 30 Car. ii. St. ii. c. 1, commonly called the declaration against Popery."

also to take the said oaths,* or declaration of fidelity hereinafter mentioned, in case such person scruples the taking of an oath; and upon refusal thereof, such justice of the peace is hereby required to commit such person to prison, without bail or mainprize, and to certify the name of such person to the next general or quarter sessions of the peace, to be held for that county, city, town, part, or division, where such person then resides; and if such person, so committed, shall upon a second tender at the general or quarter sessions refuse to make and subscribe the declaration aforesaid, such person refusing shall be then and there recorded, and he shall be taken thenceforth to all intents and purposes for a popish recusant convict, and suffer accordingly, and incur all the penalties and forfeitures of all the aforesaid laws."

subscribe the oath of allegiance and abjuration, and of protestation and declaration herein before prescribed, and upon refusal thereof, such justice of the peace is hereby required to commit such person to prison, without bail or mainprize, and to certify the name of such person to the next general or quarter sessions of the peace, to be held for that county, city, town, part, or division, where such person then resides; and if such person, so committed, shall upon a second tender at the general or quarter sessions refuse to take and subscribe such oath of allegiance and abjuration, and of protestation and declaration as aforesaid, such person refusing shall be then and there recorded, and he shall be taken thenceforth to all intents and purposes for a popish recusant, and suffer accordingly, and incur all penalties and forfeitures as if this act had not been made."

"It is further to be observed that the clause does not authorize justices to tender the oath TO ALL CATHOLICS generally, but to those Catholics only, *who should frequent the chapels certified by the act.* To these it is expressly confined. To those Catholics, therefore, who kept from places of worship of that description, it could not be tendered under the clause in question," &c.

* "The oaths referred to here are the oaths prescribed by the 1st of William and Mary, c. 1."

[M.]

(*From page* 414.)

RESOLUTIONS, LETTERS, AND DECREES RELATING TO BLANCHARDISM.

(They are nearly all embodied in Dr. Milner's "Supplement to a Pastoral Letter;" the only exception, the extract last given, is taken from the Third Part of Milner's Pastoral Charge.)

"Wolverhampton, July 11, 1809.

"We, the undersigned Catholic secular clergy, being assembled at our triennial meeting, do solemnly declare that we hold communion with his Holiness Pope Pius VII., that we obey his authority as successor of the Prince of the Apostles in the See of Rome, and that we revere his virtues; that we adhere to the condemnation and censures which the vicars apostolic of England, and the Catholic metropolitans and other Catholic bishops of Ireland, have pronounced upon certain publications in the French language, some of which have been translated into English, of the Sieur Blanchard and others, representing our Holy Father Pope Pius VII. as the author of schism and heresy, and as being himself a schismatic and a heretic, and thereby invalidating the spiritual powers which our ecclesiastical superiors, and we through them, have received from his Holiness.*

"John Perry, Vicar Gen.
Thos. Potts, S.T.P.
Thos. Southworth, Presid. of Sedg. Col.
John Roe
John Kirk
James Tasker
Edw. Eyre
Joseph Birch
Walter Blount
Jos. Bowdon
Edw. Peach
Francis Martyn
Francis Oliv. Racine
Robert Richmond
John Reeve
Samuel Rock
Francis Bishop
Thos. Price
Rich. Prendergrast
James Corne
G. Howe
L. Morais
John Quick
Thos. Walsh, Archdeacon."

* Supplement to a Pastoral Letter, p. 6: London, 1809.

*Extract of a Letter from the Catholic Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of Ireland to the Bishop of Castabala.**

"Since your last letters came to hand, sets of Blanchard's schismatical pamphlets, for me and my suffragan prelates, were forwarded hither by a Captain Malassez. The writer, and his associates in schism and spiritual rebellion, greatly mistake the character of the Irish Catholic prelates, if they suppose there is a single individual among them who will not feel highly indignant on reading such impious productions, calculated not only to destroy entirely the authority of Christ's Vicegerent on earth, but also to throw the Church into a state of complete anarchy and confusion. I am certain there is not a Catholic prelate in Ireland who will not wish with me to have it proclaimed to the world, as in fact the whole of our conduct does proclaim, that we are in communion with his Holiness Pope Pius VII., and with all those who are in communion with him. We also wish to have it known to mankind, that we venerate his sacred person and respect his virtues, particularly his prudence, his apostolical zeal, his fortitude and magnanimity in bearing persecution for righteousness' sake. I can with equal truth say, from the thorough knowledge I have of their orthodoxy and attachment to Catholic unity, that there is not an individual of our prelacy who does not condemn and reprobate, as I do, the schismatical conduct and writings of Abbé Blanchard and his associates; and it is to us matter of great surprise, that of the numerous French emigrant bishops still residing in England, whom we respect and honour as confessors of the faith, not one, that we know of, has come forward to censure and condemn, or even to disapprove of the heterodox theories and disorganizing maxims broached and propagated by their countrymen.

"✠ R. R."

Extract of a Letter to the Bishop of Castabala from the Catholic Archbishop of Cashel.

"Drogheda, May 10, 1809.

"Little did I think Mr. Blanchard and Co. would go the lengths they have done. And after I had read the sequel, I could not but feel surprised and concerned at the silence of the French prelates in Eng-

* Supplement to a Pastoral Letter, pp. 12—22.

land, in so important and alarming a crisis. But it is not possible that such learned and venerable personages, who have so generously made the greatest sacrifices to religion, can remain any longer in such mysterious silence, especially as Mr. Blanchard has had the effrontery to declare, that he will consider the Irish Catholic prelates as adhering to his schismatical doctrines, should they pass them by unnoticed. You are no doubt satisfied that no Irish Catholic bishop is with Mr. Blanchard and his followers, but that, to a man, we are all against him and them, and that we cannot but feel highly gratified and obliged, that you have taken up the pen so timely and successfully against these adversaries of our holy religion.

" ✠ T. B."

Extract of a Letter to the Bishop of Castabala from the Catholic Archbishop of Tuam.

" Thurles, April 29, 1809.

" The sequel I have read with pleasure. I find in it the same ecclesiastical spirit, the same adherence to sound principles, which we witnessed in you before you were promoted to the episcopal dignity. What a time has Blanchard chosen to afflict the head of the Church! I trust in God that I shall not fail attending at Maynooth the 24th, and I am sure those schismatical men will have no room henceforward to quote the authority of the Irish bishops.

" ✠ E. D."

" Tuam, May 6, 1809.

" On the 6th of June a Synod of the Catholic prelates of the archbishopric of Dublin was held at Tullow, in which, says the venerable Metropolitan who gives me an account of it in his letter dated June 13, ' We all signed a declaration of our communion with Pius VII., and damnatory of several propositions extracted from the " Abus sans Example."(1) We confined our consideration to the Abus, as in that publication Blanchard appealed to the Irish prelates, and did not notice Gaschet or others, although implicitly condemned by us, inasmuch as they advocate his fundamental principles.

" ✠ J. T. T."

(1) The terms of the censure are not here given, because they will be seen below, in the following Declaration of the Archbishops and Bishops.

Declaration of the Roman Catholic Prelates of Ireland, concerning certain Opinions lately published in England.

"Whereas we, the under-written archbishops and bishops of the Roman Catholic Church of Ireland, have been called upon to declare our judgment concerning certain opinions lately published in England, and there condemned by our right reverend brothers the bishops of Centuriæ and Castabala, vicars apostolical, from which condemnation a pretended appeal has been conveyed to us in a book entitled, 'Abus sans Example de l'Autorité Ecclésiastique, pour flétrir et opprimer l'Innocence, &c. &c., by Pierre Louis Blanchard, styling himself Curé de St. Hyppolite, Diocèse de Lisieux, Normandie. A Londres, de l'imprimerie de R. Juigné, 17, Margaret-street, Cavendish-square; Se vend chez M. De la Roche, 5, King-street, Portman-square; et chez l'Auteur, 81, High-street, Marylebone, 1808.'

"And whereas the said Pierre Louis Blanchard has signified in his said book, that he will consider our silence as an approbation of the opinions therein asserted, and already mentioned to have been condemned.

"For these reasons we have thought it expedient, without entertaining the said pretended appeal, which we declare to be irregular, nugatory, and invalid, to take into consideration the reasons alleged by the said pretended appellant; and having examined the propositions hereafter set down, as well separately taken, as compared with the context of the above-mentioned work of the said Pierre Louis Blanchard, we have unanimously agreed to the following resolutions:—

"First, We profess and teach that Pius VII., the now bishop of Rome, is the true and supreme pastor of the Catholic Church: that we adhere to him as the undoubted successor of Peter, and that he is fully and justly in possession of all spiritual powers, which, by reason of the primacy divinely established in the Church of Christ, of right belong to the chief bishop of Christians, and to the teacher of all Christians.

"Secondly, We declare, that adhering as we have done from the beginning to the dogmatical decisions of Pius VI., of holy remembrance, concerning the so-called civil constitution of the clergy of France, and judging after those decisions that the said constitution was impious in its suggestions, heretical in its pretensions, schismatical in several of its provisions, and on the whole to be rejected; we judge at the same time that our holy father Pius VII. has not meant to ap-

prove, and by no colour or inference has he approved of the errors, heresies, or impious principles contained in the said civil constitution of the clergy, or of any of them; but that, especially in his measure for the restoration of Catholic unity, and the peaceful exercise of true religion in France, he has adhered to that which was dogmatical in the said decisions of his predecessor, and that he has only yielded what the dreadful exigencies of the times demanded from a true shepherd of the Christian flock, in commiseration of such days as had never appeared from the beginning of the world, and if they had not been shortened on account of the elect, all flesh would not have been saved.

" Thirdly, We declare that in the pontifical acts already mentioned of Pius VII., he has validly, and agreeably to the spirit of the sacred canons, exerted the powers belonging to the Apostolical See; that he has effectually restored the Catholic Christians of France to the visible body of the Church, and that he has thereby imputed to them a true communion with the Universal Church, that being restored to God through Christ, they may have remission of their sins in the holy spirit. And we accept, approve, and concur with the said acts of Pius VII. as good, rightful, authentic, and necessary, inspired by charity, and done in the faith of his predecessor.

" As we are willing and prompt to make this declaration in testimony of the one Catholic Church, and in the defence of its visible head, Pius VII., *for whose deliverance*, as formerly for that of Peter, *the prayer of the Church is unceasingly offered up to God*, so it is with unfeigned grief we find ourselves compelled to reprehend the works or assertions of a man, who appears to have belonged to that glorious Church of France, which in these last days has crowned its faith by confession, and its confession by martyrdom; in the sufferings of which we sorrowed, and for the deliverance of which we prayed; but being reduced to the necessity of either acting with pastoral authority and animadversion, or surrendering the sacred trust confided to us, we follow the example of him who has said, '*If thy right eye scandalize thee, pluck it out and cast it forth from thee; and again, unless a man hate his very soul, he cannot be my disciple.*'

" Wherefore, having seen the following propositions asserted by the said Pierre Louis Blanchard, and having examined them, we declare them respectively *false*, *calumnious*, and *scandalous*, inasmuch as they regard the acts of Pius VII., in his restoration and settlement of the churches of France, as manifestly tending to schism, most dangerous

at this time to the peace and unity of the Catholic Church, exciting and inviting to schism, not only schismatical but dogmatizing schism, usurping ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and subversive of Church authority.

"The propositions are these following:—

"Page 38. 'L'Eglise du Concordat n'est pas Catholique.'

"Page 60. 'L'hérésie vient d'obtenir en France un triomphe complet, et Pie VII. en est la première et la principale cause.'

"Page 95. 'Une Eglise aussi complètement asservie ne peut être l'Eglise de Jésus-Christ.'

"Page 99. 'Les Evêques concordataires doivent être evités par les fidèles jaloux d'opérer leur salut.'

"Ibid. 'Ils n'ont pas reçu de Jésus-Christ les pouvoirs essentiellement libres dans leur principe et dans leur exercice.'

"Page 109. 'Un des sujets de leurs justes plaintes (des Evêques de France) c'est que Pie VII. par sa foiblesse, ait introduit le schisme même et l'hérésie dans le sein de l'Eglise.'

"Page 134. 'Quant à ce Pape (Pius VII.) je dis seulement qu'il faut le denoncer à l'Eglise Catholique, encore sans spécifier si c'est comme hérétique et schismatique, ou uniquement pour avoir violé les règles saintes.'

"Page 137. 'Pie VII. serait hérétique et schismatique par l'abandon et même par le mépris d'une décision solemnelle de l'Eglise.'

"This proposition separately taken is equivocal, but it is to be considered along with the three following:—

"Page 62. 'Nous avous donc dans la décision de Pie VI. contre la constitution civile du clergé, celle de l'Eglise universelle même.'

"Page 117. 'Pie VII. par la formation de l'Eglise concordataire a, en effet, révoqué les brefs de son prédécesseur, et admis les principes fondamentaux de la *constitution civile du clergé.*'

"Ibid. 'Comment Pie VII. a-t-il formé ce fantome d'Eglise? Il l'a formé sur les bases mêmes que Pie VI. avait condamnées comme impies, hérétiques, et schismatiques.'

"These propositions we reject and condemn, without approving or intending to approve many other propositions maintained by the said P. L. Blanchard as connected with the foregoing, and without entertaining, as we have already declared, the said pretended appeal, or approving of it in form or substance.

"In testimony of all which, we, the aforesaid archbishops and

bishops, have signed our names to this our solemn declaration and decision.

"Dublin, 3rd July, 1809."

"Richard O'Reilly, D.D., Armagh.
Thomas Bray, D.D., Cashell.
Francis Moylan, D.D., Cork.
P. J. Plunket, D.D., Meath.
John Cruise, D.D., Ardagh.
John Power, D.D., Waterford and Lismore.
Hor. MacCarthy, D.D., Antinoe Coad., Cork.
E. Dillon, D.D., Tuam.
J. Caulfield, D.D., Ferns.
J. T. Troy, D.D., Dublin.
Daniel Delany, D.D., Kildare and Leighlin.
James Larrigan, D.D., Ossory.
F. French, D.D., Elphin.
T. Costello, D.D., Clonfert.
John Flynn, D.D., Elect Achonry.
Patrick Ryan, D.D., Germanicia, Coad., Ferns.
Daniel Murray, D.D., Coad. Elect, Dublin."

"I hereby certify that the underwritten prelates, not present at the assembly of their brethren on the 3rd of July, have approved the foregoing solemn declaration and decision, and authorized me by their respective letters to affix their signatures thereto, J. T. Troy, D.D., Dublin.

"August 21st, 1809."

"William Coppinger, D.D., Cloyne and Ross.
P. Mac Mullen, D.D., Down and Connor.
E. Derry, D.D., Dromore.
Chas. O'Donnell, D.D., Derry.
N. J., Archdeacon, D.D., Kilmacduagh and Kilfinora.
Dominick Bellew, D.D., Kilalla.
C. Sughrue, D.D., Kerry.
James Murphy, D.D., Clogher.
J. O'Shaughnessy, D.D. Killaloe.
P. Mac Loughlin, D.D., Raphoe.
F. Reilly, D. D., Kilmore.
Val. Bodkin, D.D., Ward, Galway."

"Thus," continues Dr. Milner's Supplement, "you see, my beloved brethren, that the schismatical system of this turbulent anarchist, who had refused submission to the decisions of his own bishop, supported by that of all the bishops in this country, has been distinctly, emphatically, and unanimously condemned by the whole Catholic Hierarchy of Ireland, to which he had three times solemnly appealed. Never did Providence afford a more timely succour to his Church, or at least to our portion of it, than in this act of the vigilance, charity, and zeal of those exemplary prelates. But what part will the unhappy leader of schism now act? He is deeply pledged, as you have seen above, to

stand by the decision of the French emigrant bishops, and of the Catholic bishops of Ireland. The former, who are few, unconnected, and destitute of every degree of spiritual jurisdiction, are totally silent as to the appeal of the Sieur Blanchard. Indeed, they are not known to have opened their lips at all in public since the 6th of April, 1803, when, addressing Pius VII. in the words of St. Jerom, they exclaimed, 'Quicumque tecum non colligit spargit;' words more edifying, more apposite, more replete with salutary doctrine, never were uttered! On the other hand, the Irish bishops who are numerous, and who form a complete and efficient hierarchy, have spoken clearly and unanimously, and their decision confirms the judgment of their brethren, the Catholic prelates of this country."

The third part of Dr. Milner's pastoral charge embodies the resolution of the vicars apostolic against Blanchard, in the following manner:—

"The four vicars apostolic having met together in Synod, February, 1810, by and with the advice of the two coadjutors, and of seven other theologians, unanimously adopted the following among other resolutions: that 'Priests adhering to Blanchard or his system should be required to acknowledge that Pius VII. is neither a heretic, nor a schismatic, nor the author or abettor of heresy or schism. Those who refuse to acknowledge the above articles are to be forbidden to exercise any ecclesiastical functions, and to say Mass within the respective districts.'*

[N.]

(*From page* 446.)

TWO EXTRACTS TO SHOW THE NATURE OF THE "DECLARATION OF THE CATHOLIC BISHOPS;" LONDON: 1826.

"*Section III.—On the Holy Scriptures.*

"In England the Catholic Church is held out as an enemy to the reading and circulating the Holy Scriptures.

"Whereas the Catholic Church venerates the Holy Scriptures as the written part of the word of God; she has in all ages been the faithful guardian of this sacred deposit; she has ever laboured to preserve the integrity of these inspired writings, and the true sense in which

* Dr. Milner's Pastoral Charge, Part iii. p. 8.

they have been universally understood, at all times from the Apostolic age.

"The Catholic Church has never forbidden or discouraged the reading or the circulation of authentic copies of the Sacred Scriptures, in the original languages. She binds her clergy to the daily recital of a canonical office, which comprises a large portion of the sacred volume, and to read and expound to the faithful, in the vernacular tongue, on Sundays, the epistle or gospel of the day, or some other portion of the divine law.

"As to translations of the Holy Scriptures into modern languages, the Catholic Church requires that none should be put into the hands of the faithful but such as are acknowledged by ecclesiastical authority to be accurate, and conformable to the sense of the originals. There never was a general law of the Catholic Church prohibiting the reading of authorized translations of the Scriptures; but, considering that many, by their ignorance and evil dispositions, have perverted the meaning of the sacred text to their own destruction, the Catholic Church has thought it prudent to make a regulation, that the faithful should be guided in this matter by the advice of their respective pastors.

"Whether the Holy Scriptures, which ought never to be taken in hand but with respect, should be made a class-book for children, is a matter of religious and prudential consideration, on which the pastors of the Catholic Church have a right to decide with regard to their own flocks; and we hold that in this matter none have a right to dictate to them.

"The Catholics in England, of mature years, have permission to read authentic and approved translations of the Holy Scriptures, with explanatory notes; and are exhorted to read them in the spirit of piety, humility, and obedience.

"Pope Pius VII., in a rescript dated April 18, 1820, and addressed to the vicars apostolic in England, earnestly exhorts them to confirm the people committed to their spiritual care, in faith and good works; and for that end, to encourage them to read books of pious instruction, and particularly the Holy Scriptures, in translations approved by ecclesiastical authority; because, to those who are well disposed, nothing can be more useful, more consoling, or more animating, than the reading of the sacred Scriptures, understood in their true sense—they serve to confirm the faith, to support the hope, and to inflame the charity of the true Christian.

"But when the reading and the circulation of the Scriptures are

urged and recommended as the entire rule of faith, as the sole means by which men are to be brought to the certain and specific knowledge of the doctrines, precepts, and institutions of Christ; and when the Scriptures so read and circulated are left to the interpretation and private judgment of each individual: then such reading, circulation, and interpretation, are forbidden by the Catholic Church, because the Catholic Church knows that the circulation of the Scriptures, and the interpretation of them by each one's private judgment, was not the means ordained by Christ for the communication of the true knowledge of his law to all nations—she knows that Christianity was established in many countries before one book of the New Testament was written —that it was not by means of the Scriptures that the Apostles and their successors converted nations, or any one nation, to the unity of the Christian faith—that the unauthorized reading and circulation of the Scriptures, and the interpretation of them by private judgment, are calculated to lead men to contradictory doctrines on the primary articles of Christian belief; to inconsistent forms of worship, which cannot all be constituent parts of the uniform and sublime system of Christianity; to errors and fanaticism in religion, and to seditions and the greatest disorders in states and kingdoms."

"*Section X.—On the Doctrine of Exclusive Salvation.*

"Catholics are charged with uncharitableness, in holding the doctrine of exclusive salvation.

"Catholics are taught by their Church to love all men, without exception: to wish that all may be saved; and to pray that all may be saved, and may come to the knowledge of the truth, by which they may be saved.

"If the Almighty himself has assigned certain conditions, without the observance of which man cannot be saved, it would seem to be an act of impiety to attempt to annul those divinely-established conditions: and an act of great uncharitableness towards a fellow-man, to tell him that he may be saved, without complying with the conditions prescribed by the Almighty.

"The doctrinal principle of exclusive salvation belong to the laws of Christ.

"Has not Christ, who commands the belief of his revealed doctrines, pronounced that he that believeth not shall be condemned? (Mark xvi. 16.) Has not Christ, who instituted baptism for the remission of sins, declared that except a man be born again of water and of the

Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God? (John iii. 5.) Has not St. Paul enumerated a list of crimes, such as adultery, idolatry, hatred, seditions, heresies, murders, drunkenness, &c., of which he declares, that they who do such things shall not obtain the kingdom of God? (Galat. v. 21.) Are not these exclusive conditions?

"Whoever professes the law of Christ, must profess the principle and doctrine of exclusive salvation. It is not the Catholic, it is God himself who will exclude from heaven those who are not duly qualified for it by faith and good works.

"But the Catholic, whilst he is bound to admit, and with firm faith to believe, this doctrinal principle, is bound also by the divine commandment not to judge. He is not allowed therefore to pronounce sentence of condemnation on individuals who may live and die out of the external communion of the Catholic Church: nor to pronounce sentence of condemnation against those who may die in an apparent state of sin. All those he leaves to the righteous judgment of the great searcher of hearts, who at the last day will render to every man according to his works.

"But surely charity, as well as truth, must forbid one Christian to deceive another, in a matter of such infinite importance as the eternal salvation of his soul. He who should persuade his neighbour that no condition for salvation is required on the part of man, would deceive him. He who admits that any one such condition is required by the Almighty, admits the principle of exclusive salvation."

[P.]

(*From page* 448.)

AN EXTRACT FROM WHAT IS KNOWN AS THE ACT OF EMANCIPATION OF 1829, OR AS "A BILL INTITULED AN ACT FOR THE RELIEF OF HIS MAJESTY'S ROMAN CATHOLIC SUBJECTS."

"And be it enacted, that from and after the commencement of this act, it shall be lawful for any person professing the Roman Catholic religion, being a peer, or who shall after the commencement of this act be returned as a member of the House of Commons, to sit and vote in either House of Parliament respectively, being in all other respects duly qualified to sit and vote therein, upon taking and subscribing the

following oath, instead of the oaths of allegiance, supremacy, and abjuration :—

"I, A. B., do sincerely promise and swear, that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to his majesty King George IV., and will defend him to the utmost of my power against all conspiracies, and attempts whatever which shall be made against his person, crown, or dignity; and I will do my utmost endeavour to disclose and make known to his majesty, his heirs and successors, all treasons and traitorous conspiracies, which may be formed against him or them. And I do faithfully promise to maintain, support and defend to the utmost of my power, the succession of the crown, which succession, by an act intituled 'An act for the further limitation of the crown, and better securing the rights and liberties of the subject,' is, and stands limited to the Princess Sophia, electress of Hanover, and the heirs of her body, being Protestants; hereby utterly renouncing and abjuring any obedience or allegiance unto any other person claiming or pretending a right to the crown of this realm. And I do further declare that it is not any article of my faith, and that I do renounce, reject, and abjure the opinion, that princes excommunicated or deprived by the Pope, or any other authority of the see of Rome, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects or by any person whatsoever. And I do declare that I do not believe that the Pope of Rome, or any other foreign prince, person, prelate, state or potentate, hath or ought to have any temporal or civil jurisdiction, power, superiority, or pre-eminence, directly or indirectly, within this realm. I do swear that I will defend to the utmost of my power the settlement of property within this realm as established by the laws; and I do hereby disclaim, disavow, and solemnly abjure any intention to subvert the present church establishment, as settled by law in this realm; and I do solemnly swear that I never will exercise any privilege to which I am or may become entitled, to disturb or weaken the Protestant religion or Protestant government in the United Kingdom; and I do solemnly in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, that I do make this declaration and every part thereof in a plain and ordinary sense of the words of this oath, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatever.

"So help me God."

[R.]

(*From page* 465.)

From the Reformation to the present time, the Protestants have always been willing not only to allow, but to encourage, "the weeds" flung from "the Pope's garden," to flourish within their own enclosure. Of this, the following pastoral is sufficient but dreary confirmation :—

"Among the late writers who have most distinguished themselves by their ridicule and blasphemy against our holy religion, is an apostate Catholic priest, of a nation hitherto the most firmly attached to it. We know nothing of him, except what he tells us of himself; but we have learned, from the history of other apostate priests in this country, how to credit their veracity, and to trust to their consistency. For example, there was an Italian archbishop, Mark Anthony de Dominis, in the reign of James I., who, professing a great horror of the Popedom, and being rewarded for his apostasy with the deanery of Windsor, finished by withdrawing himself from this country, abjuring its religion, and submitting himself to the Pontiff. There was, more recently, the noted Scotch Jesuit, Archibald Bower, who, having imposed on the British public with lying stories of the Italian Inquisition, and of his escape from it, and thereby, together with his irreligious publications, amassed a large sum of money, was detected by a Protestant bishop in a pecuniary transaction with his former associates, preparatory to his taking the same step which the former took. There was, in our own days, an English Jesuit, Austin Jennison, who having, after his scandalous fall, obtained an opulent benefice in the neighbourhood of Edinburgh, with other comforts of life, as they are called, felt himself so miserable in his conscience, that he suffered a hell upon earth, to use his own expression, in a letter which passed through my hands, to the person who had been the occasion of his apostasy. The conclusion of his story was, that he privately withdrew himself from his situation, first to London, and then to the continent, where he passed the remainder of his life in poverty and penance. Finally, there was, about the same time, an Irish secular priest, the Rev. James Doran, with whom also I had some connection, who having scandalously fallen from his religious engagements, became so miserable and desperate, that he tried to silence the reproaches of his conscience with a loaded pistol, at an ill-acquired estate, which he got possession of in the neighbourhood of

Newbury. I could enlarge this melancholy account with similar histories, but these are sufficient to guard you against the scandal of ecclesiastical apostasy. With respect to the unhappy apostate who is the occasion of my entering upon this subject, we learn from his book, that taking orders in the Catholic Church, he long exercised the ministry of it, and even that of the Sacred Tribunal, without believing in the principles of Christianity; that coming into this country, he violated his voluntary vow of celibacy, by entering into matrimonial engagements, to which St. Paul annexes the guilt of damnation; and that he soon made up to the ministry of the loaves and fishes, under the pretence of his being converted to Christianity, and to the Establishment, by hearing a common hymn sung in one of the churches. In conclusion, we are indeed to lament the spiritual loss of every immortal soul; but when an unbelieving or immoral pastor of the true Church throws off the sheep's skin with which he had been clothed, we cannot but see what an advantage it is to the flock that an end should be put to his devastations among it. In like manner, when plans of emancipating our holy religion, which contain more of detriment than of benefit to it, fail, such as those have been which for many past years have been brought forward, we have reason to bless God, rather than to grieve."

JOHN, BISHOP OF CASTABALA, Vicar Apostolic,
Pastoral Admonitions for the Lent of 1826.

Wolverhampton, Feb. 1, 1826.

[S.]

(*Page* 466.)

TWO PASTORALS CONTAINING THE PRINCIPAL CHANGES WHICH HAVE BEEN MADE DURING THE LAST EIGHTY YEARS IN THE DAYS OF OBLIGATION, AND OF FASTING AND ABSTINENCE.

I. "Our holy Father Pope Pius VI., in consideration of the circumstances in which the Catholics of this kingdom are situated, has (on the 9th of March, 1777,) been pleased to dispense in their regard with the precept of hearing Mass and abstaining from servile work on all holy days throughout the year, excepting those that are here underwritten. But it must be observed that those festivals which his Holiness has dispensed with are henceforward to be only considered as

days of devotion, and as such must be diligently recommended by the pastors to all the faithful. As to the vigils or fasting days annexed to the festivals which are now abolished or dispensed with, his Holiness has ordained that in lieu thereof the faithful shall fast on all Wednesdays and Fridays in Advent, in the same manner as in Lent.

A list of those holy days which his Holiness has strictly commanded to be kept holy, and without any servile work:—

All Sundays in the Year.
The Circumcision of our Lord, or New Year's Day.
The Epiphany, or Twelfth Day.
The Annunciation of our Lady.
Easter Monday.
The Ascension of our Lord.
Whit-Monday.
Corpus Christi Day.
St. Peter and St. Paul.
The Assumption of our Lady.
All Saints' Day.
Christmas Day.

N.B.—In case of any great or extraordinary necessity, every one is obliged to have recourse to his pastor for leave to work on those festivals above mentioned, after he has heard Mass.

JOANNES PHILOMELIEN.
THOMAS ACONEN."

II. "Whilst we derived much comfort and edification from the fervor, the strict fidelity with which the ecclesiastical precepts of fasting, of abstinence, of sanctifying the holy days of obligation, were observed by many of the dear flock of Jesus Christ intrusted to our care; we witnessed with compassion and regret the severe privations, the extreme difficulty that, from the growing distress of latter years, the far greater number of you, particularly of the labouring classes, experienced in your pious exertions to comply with these sacred ordinances.

Under this impression, sensible that, though immutable in her faith, the Catholic Church, as a tender mother, hath ever tempered her discipline according to the exigencies of the times, we, having seriously weighed the matter before God, and collected on the important subject the sentiments of our beloved clergy, considered it a duty of charity to unite with our venerable brethren the vicars apostolic of the three other districts in England, in soliciting our holy Father Pope Pius VIII. to mitigate in these points the rigour of the ancient discipline.

This our humble petition was graciously received by his Holiness, who hath lately sent to us, through the medium of the Sacred Congregation de Propagandâ Fide, two rescripts; by virtue of one of which

rescripts our holy Father hath granted henceforth to the Catholics in England a dispensation from the obligation of abstinence from flesh meat on the festival of St. Mark, on the three Rogation Days, and on all Saturdays which are not fasting days; and by virtue of the other of these rescripts, our holy Father has granted henceforth to the Catholics in England a dispensation from the obligation of hearing Mass and resting from servile works on Easter Monday and on Whit-Monday, at the same time transferring the observance of the Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary to the Sunday immediately succeeding that festival."

Thos. Walsh, Bishop of Cambysopolis.

Baddesley, August 10th, 1830.

[T.]

At the time of the suppression of monasteries, the Black Friars or Dominicans possessed fifty-three houses in England. The survivors were assembled by Mary in their old convent of St. Bartholomew, Smithfield; but were speedily obliged to leave it once more, and either to flee to the houses of their Order upon the continent, or to remain concealed, to aid as far as possible in assisting the faithful in England. Mourning with its accustomed zeal over the spiritual miseries of Great Britain and Ireland, the Order decreed, in a general chapter in 1650 (what indeed had been partially acted upon before), that the young men of those countries might be admitted as novices, and finally professed, with the express object of being in due time sent home as missionaries.

Eight years after this determination, one of the most zealous brethren of the Order, Philip Howard (grandson of the earl of Arundel and Surrey), afterwards cardinal, assembled the English Dominicans in a separate house at Bornhem, near Antwerp. In 1661, he assembled the English Dominicanesses in a house at Vilvorden, near Brussels, and afterwards in Brussels itself. It is scarcely necessary to add that these houses were overthrown by the French Revolution.*

* See Dr. Oliver's Gleanings in his recent Collect. pp. 448 and 460. For the transfer, in 1850, of Woodchester from the Passionists to the Dominicans, see the same Collect. p. 168.

ADDENDA TO THE ACCOUNT (IN PP. 215, ETC.) OF THE SIX ARTICLES.

The replies to the Six Articles in the text, are those of the confessors who afterwards suffered death. The replies of Orton, Bosgrave, and Hart may be seen in "Butler's Memoirs" (I., p. 229, 2nd ed.); Butler's own remarks, however, contain some evident inaccuracies.

Those that were put on trial for the pretended plot at Rheims and Rome (being presented in two parties for arraignment and sentence) were the following:—First band,—Sherwine, Kirby, Cottam, Johnson, and Rishton, five priests of Douay College, besides Campion and Bosgrave, Jesuits, and Orton, a layman; second band,—Colleton, Richardson, John Hart, Ford, Filby, Brian or Briant, and Shert, all educated at Douay, although Shert was ordained at Rome, and Brian, whilst actually in prison, was admitted into the Society of Jesus. Thus the entire band consisted of fourteen priests and one layman. They were all condemned except Colleton, whose *alibi* was proved and admitted. Of the fourteen thus condemned, four ultimately escaped with their lives. These were Hart, Rishton, Bosgrave, and Orton.

Some suppose that they escaped death from the satisfactory nature of their replies. Certainly the opinions expressed by Bosgrave and Orton were all that the government could desire. Yet Hart, at all events, could scarcely have been favoured on such a pretext. To five of the articles he declined to reply; and the second, the only one to which he attempted a reply, he but partially answered. Elizabeth, he said, was his lawful queen, "notwithstanding the bull supposed to be published by Pius Quintus," but whether she would still be so, "notwithstanding any bull or sentence that the Pope can give, he saith he cannot answer."

Whatever the motive at first for not putting the four prisoners to death, they were all, it seems, detained for some time in prison. It was not until the midsummer of 1585, and even then not without the pressing intercession of Stephen, king of Poland, that Bosgrave was at last released from the Tower. Hart was released at the same time.*

* Compare with Butler (*ut antea*), Challoner (*passim*), and Dr. Oliver's two Collections; John Hart and James Bosgrave, 1845, and p. 244, 1857.

THE VICARS APOSTOLIC OF THE FOUR VICARIATES.

The London, or Southern District.

Name.	Title.	Date of Consecration.	Death.
1. John Leyburn	Adrumetum	Sept. 1685	June 20, 1702
2. Bonaventure Giffard . . .	(*See Midland District.*)		Mar. 22, 1733
3. Benjamin Petre. . . .	Prusa . .	. . .	Dec. 22, 1758
4. Richard Challoner . . .	Debra . .	Jan. 29, 1741	Jan. 12, 1781
5. James Talbot	Birtha . .	Aug. 24, 1759	Jan. 26, 1790
6. John Douglass	Centuriæ .	Dec. 19, 1790	May 8, 1812
7. William Poynter . . .	Halia. . .	May 28, 1803	Dec. 11, 1827
8. James Yorke Bramston . .	Usula . .	June 29, 1823	July 11, 1836
Robert Gradwell (Coadjutor) .	Lydda . .	June 1828	Mar. 15, 1833
9. Thomas Griffiths . . .	Olena. . .	Oct. 28, 1833	Aug. 12, 1847
10. Thomas Walsh	(*See Midland District.*)		Feb. 18, 1849

11. Nicholas Wiseman (See Midland District), the present Cardinal, and the first Archbishop of Westminster.

The Western District.

Name.	Title.	Date of Consecration.	Death.
1. Philip Ellis	Aureliopolis	May 6, 1688	Nov. 16, 1726
2. Mathew Pritchard, O.S.F. .	Myrinensis .	Whitsuntide, 1715	May 22, 1750
3. Lawrence York, O.S.B. . .	Nibensis. .	Aug. 10, 1741	*Apr. 14, 1770
4. Charles Walmesley . . .	Ramensis .	Dec. 21, 1756	Nov. 25, 1797
5. William Gregory Sharrock, O.S.B.	Telmessus .	Aug. 12, 1780	Oct. 17, 1809
6. Peter Bernardine Collingridge, O.S.F.	Thespiæ . .	Oct. 11, 1807	Mar. 3, 1829
7. Peter Augustine Baines, O.S.B.	Siga . . .	May 1, 1823	July 6, 1843
8. Charles Michael Baggs . .	Pella . . .	Jan. 28, 1844	Oct. 16, 1845
9. William Bernard Ullathorne, O.S.B.	Hetalona .	June 21, 1846	
	(Transferred to Birmingham.)		
10. Joseph William Hendren, O.S.F.	Uranopolis .	Sept. 10, 1848	

* Resigned his Vicariate in 1764.

Vicars Apostolic of the old Northern District.

Name.	Title.	Date of Consecration.	Death.
1. James Smith	Callipolis	1688	May 20, 1711
2. George Witham	(*See Midland District.*)		April 15, 1725
3. Thomas Dominic Williams, O.S.D.	Tiberiopolis	1726	April 3, 1740
4. Edward Dicconson	Mallensis	Mar. 19, 1741	April 24, 1752
5. Francis Petre	Amoriensis	Jan. 27, 1750	Dec. 24, 1775
William Miare (Coadjutor).	Cinnensis	1763	July 25, 1769
6. William Walton	Traconensis	1770	Feb. 26, 1780
7. Mathew Gibson	Comanensis	1780	May 17, 1790
8. William Gibson	Acanthensis	Dec. 6, 1790	June 2, 1821
9. Thomas Smith	Bolinensis	Mar. 11, 1810	July 30, 1831
10. Thomas Penswick	Europum	June 29, 1824	Jan. 28, 1836
11. John Briggs	Trachis	June 29, 1833	

Vicars Apostolic of the Midland or Eastern District.

Name.	Title.	Date of Consecration.	Death.
1. Bonaventure Giffard	Madaura	April 22, 1688	(Transferred to the London District)
2. George Witham	Marcopolis	April 15, 1703	(Transferred to the North District in 1716)
3. John Talbot Stonor	Thespiæ	1716	March, 1756
4. John Hornyold	Philomelia	1753	Dec. 26, 1778
5. Thomas Talbot	Acon	1766	Feb. 24, 1795
Charles Berington (Coadjutor)	Hiero-Cæsarea	Aug. 1, 1786	June 8, 1798
6. Gregory Stapleton	Hiero-Cæsarea	Mar. 8, 1801	May 23, 1802
7. John Milner	Castabala	May 22, 1803	April 19, 1826
8. Thomas Walsh	Cambysopolis	May 1, 1825	(Transferred to the London District in August, 1848)
Nicholas Wiseman (Coadjutor)	Melipotamus	June 8, 1840	(Appointed Pro-Vicar of the London District, Sept. 2, 1847)

When four new vicariates were created (A.D. 1840), that of Wales was given to the care of Dr. Thomas Joseph Brown, O.S.B., the bishop of Apollonia; that of Lancashire, including also Cheshire, to Dr. George Brown, the bishop of Bugia; that which was named the Eastern, being a part of the old Midland, to Dr. William Wareing, the bishop of Areopolis. The new Northern, comprising the four most northern counties, was intended for Dr. Weedall; but his refusal being accepted, was given to Dr. Francis Mostyn, as bishop of Abydos. Dr. Mostyn dying August 11, 1847, and his coadjutor, Dr. Riddell, bishop of Longo, having died in the preceding year (Nov. 2, 1846), the Northern District was given to Dr. William Hogarth, the present bishop of Hexham.

The Central District, as the remaining part of the Old Midland was now called, was, on the removal of Dr. Walsh, put under the rule of Dr. William Bernard Ullathorne, O.S.B., the bishop of Hetalona, August 30, 1848, and the present bishop of Birmingham. See Western District.

INDEX.

N.B.—The small Roman numerals denote the volume, and the Arabic figures the page; *n.* refers to the foot-note.

Aaron and Julian, martyrs, i. 7.
Abbots, how chosen, &c., i. 122, 177.
Abb's Head, St., why so called, i. 130.
Abingdon, monastery of, i. 209, 213, 219.
Abingdon, house of, at Henlip, &c., ii. 279.
Abjuration, oath of, ii. 331.
Acca, St. Wilfrid's companion and successor in the see of Hexham, i. 91; converses with St. Bede, 113; his library at Hexham, 165.
Act. See Conventicle, Corporation, Test, &c.
Acton Burnel, the Benedictines at, ii. 412.
Adamnan, St., abbot of Iona, induces all the northern Irish, except his own monks, to receive the correct calculation of Easter, i. 82.
Adamnan, his penance and vision, i. 130 *et seq.*
Adela, sister of Henry I., i. 293.
Admonition, The, a work attributed to Cardinal Allen, &c., ii. 254, *n.*
Adrian, Pope, his legates, i. 167; makes Lichfield an archiepiscopal see, 170.
Adrian, abbot, his humility, i. 87; St. Theodore's companion, 88, 89.
Advent, the Wednesdays and Fridays of, why fasting days, ii. Appendix.
Ædgils, monk, narrates the fate of Coldingham, i. 132.
Ædilfrid, his victories, i. 40; his massacre of the monks of Bangor, *ib.*; his pursuit of Edwin, 49; his death, 50.
Ædilred, king of Kent, an abbot, i. 139.
Ægilric, of Chichester, i. 238.
Ælbert, of York, i. 166.
Ælfleda, a royal abbess, niece of Elfleda, i. 141.
Ælfsin, his simony and death, i. 208.
Agatho, Pope, pronounces in favour of St. Wilfrid, &c., i. 105, 108, 119, 137.
Agilbert, first bishop of the kingdom of Wessex, i. 73; visit of, to Northumbria, 73, 74; St. Wilfrid ordained by, 75, 85; present at the conference at Whitby, 76.
Aidan, St., sent from Iona to preach to the Northumbrians, i. 60; fixes his see at Lindisfarne, *ib.*; his manner of life, 60—62; foretells Oswini's death, 64; dies, 65; venerated, although he mistook the time for keeping Easter, 71, 72.
Ailwin, i. 216.
Alban, St., the proto-martyr of Britain, 8; his martyrdom, 9; miracles attending it, *ib.*; cessation of persecution in consequence, *ib.*; erection of a new church upon the site of the old monastery by King Offa, and formation of the present town of St. Alban's, *ib.*
Alberic, a legate, holds synods, i. 316.
Albertus, Pius, ii. 13, *n.*
Alcuin, i. 165, 181 *et seq.*
Aldhelm, St., becomes a monk under St. Madulf, i. 84; succeeds him as abbot, *ib.*; teaches the peasantry by singing, 84, 143; appointed to lead the Britons to the right calculation of Easter, 84; library of, at Malmesbury, 165; death of, 143.
Aldred, of Worcester and York, i. 229—232, and 231, *n.* 2.

Aldred, one of Walsingham's agents, ii. 251.
Aldwin restores the monastic institute in the north, i. 244—246.
Alexander II., Pope, his legates, i. 233; his admonition, 235; his reply to Lanfranc, 241; his decree regarding monks, 405.
Alexander III. gives audience to the envoys of Henry II., i. 361; and to St. Thomas, 367; receives St. Thomas's resignation, and restores him, 368, 369; forbids Jocelin, of Salisbury, to present to the office of dean of his chapter, 371; is deluded by Henry, 372; urged by St. Thomas to adopt severe measures, 377—379.
Alexander VII., letter of, regarding the office and oath of secular priests serving the mission, ii. 336 *et seq.*
Alexander, of Scotland, i. 304, 305.
Alfred the Great, his rashness, &c., i. 191, 192; rebuked by St. Neot, 192, 193; learns wisdom from adversity, 194; his love of relics, *ib.*; builds monasteries, 195; his prayer and affliction, *ib.*; his last contest with the Danes, 196.
Alfrid, king of Northumbria, i. 137, 140.
Algar, his heroism, i. 186, 187.
Allegiance, declaration of, ii. 289; James's oath of, and its condemnation, 292, 298, 300, 312; accepted oath of, 376 *et seq.*
Allen, Cardinal, as proctor and canon, ii. 176; founds a seminary at Douay, 177, 178; reconstructs it at Rheims, 191; obtains Jesuits for England, 200; reply to F. Campion, *ib.*; his apology, 219; his journey to Rome, 221; his reply, 224; assailed, 252; made cardinal, 254; dies, 257; opinion of, regarding a superior for the Church in England, ii. 265.
Alms, i. 161, 162; abuse of, by the rich, 162.
Altars, "sacrificial," "holy," and "the seat of the Heavenly Sacrifice," i. 10; anointed, Appendix A, 627, 628; removed, ii. 160.
Amerciament, what, i. 350.
Ampleforth, ii. 412. See also Errata to same.
Anabaptists, despotism of, ii. 326; bitterness of, 330.
Anatolius, bishop of Laodicea in the third century, his Easter calculation, i. 79.
Andrew's, St., claims of its bishop, i. 304; when made an archbishopric, 306, *n.*
Anlaff the Dane, i. 199.
Anna, of East Anglia, slain by Penda, i. 66.
Annats, appropriation of, by Henry VIII., ii. 49, 61.
Anne, St., i. 610, *n.*
Annunciation, the feast of, the obligation of transferred to the following Sunday, ii. Appendix S.
Anointing of kings, i. 10.
Anselm, St., his early life, i. 253; made abbot of Bec, 254; his conversation with Lanfranc regarding St. Elphege, 254, 255; his election to the see of Canterbury, 258 *et seq.*; writes for advice to St. Wulstan, 262; his denunciation of the effeminacy of the court, 264; his remonstrances with Rufus, 265; attempts against, at the great council in Rockingham Castle, 266—272; receives the pallium, 273, 274; defends, at Winchester, the right of free access to the Holy See, 275—278; goes to Rome, 278, 279; addresses the Council of Bari, &c., 280; stays at Lyons, 281; writings of, 282; opposes the royal investitures, 283—286; interferes, in vain, in behalf of William of Winchester, 289; goes to Rome, 290; stays at Lyons, 291; his efforts on his return, 294, 295; his last acts and death, 295, 296.
Anselm, legate, i. 298.
Apostles' Creed, i. 148, 158, 167.
Appeals, change in the order of, ii. 62.
Approbation, episcopal, question of the renewal of, ii. 313 *et seq.*
Archer, Dr., sermons of, censured by Dr. Milner, ii. 431.
Arianism, its condemnation, i. 13.
Ariminum, Council of, against the Arians, i. 14.
Arius, author of Arianism, his sudden death, i. 13.
Arles, Council of, British bishops present at, i. 12.
Arminianism, ii. 326.
Arrowsmith, Father, martyred, ii. 311.
Articles, the book of, ii. 90; the Statute of Six, *ib.*; the Forty-two, 115; the Thirty-nine, 326, 327; the Six, proposed to the condemned missionary priests, 215.
Arundel, archbishop of Canterbury, his injunction, i. 610, *n.*

Arundel, Lord, of Wardour, ii. 340; presents a Catholic petition, 342.
Arundel, earl of, charged with tampering in the elections, ii. 146.
Arundel, countess of, ii. 246.
Ashley, Ralph, capture of, ii. 279; heroic death of, 287.
Ashton, i. 582 *et seq.*
Ash-Wednesday, i. 264.
Asser, Alfred's biographer, i. 196, *n.*
Association, the Protestant, ii. 381 *et seq.*
Association, the Catholic, ii. 443.
Aston, or Escendune, battle of, against the Danes, i. 190, 191.
Athelstan the Conqueror, i. 199, 200.
Athelstan, bishop of Hereford, i. 228.
Augustine, St., sent to Britain by St. Gregory, i. 21; his hesitation, *ib.*; his journey through France, 22; his reception in England, 23, 24; his miracles and success, 25; is consecrated at Arles by St. Virgilius, the Pope's legate, 26; applies for advice to St. Gregory, 26—28; receives from Rome a new body of missionaries, 29; motives to strengthen his humility in the midst of his miracles, 33; consecrates St. Saviour's, &c., 35; his journeys, *ib.*; his conferences with the British bishops, 35—39; consecrates two suffragans, 41; his death and epitaph, *ib.*; his festival, 160.

Babington, plot of, ii. 232—236.
Bacon, Nicholas, the Lord Keeper, ii. 134; presides at the discussion at Westminster, 147.
Bacon, Roger, i. 572.
Bagshaw, Christopher, a torch of discord, ii. 199, 259, 268.
Baily, Lawrence, martyrdom of, ii. 277.
Baines, bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, once professor of Hebrew at University of Paris, ii. 151.
Baines, Richard, his fall and repentance, ii. 193—195.
Baines, Dr., account of, ii. 460.
Baldwin, a monk, St. Anselm's chamberlain, banished, i. 272, 287.
Baldwin, his election to the see of Canterbury, i. 407—411; his oppression of the monks of Canterbury, 412 *et seq.*
Baldwin, of Worcester, chosen archbishop of Canterbury, i. 409—411; his harsh treatment of the monks, 412 *et seq.*; his disregard of Urban's decision, 413 *et seq.*
Ballard, ii. 232 *et seq.*
Baltimore, John Calvert, Lord, ii. 327, *n.*
Bambridge, Cardinal, ii. 25, *n.*
Bancroft, of London, ii. 260, 273, 291, and 292, *n.*
Bangor, the hermit of, i. 38; the supposed reply of the abbot of, 39, *n.*; massacre of the monks of, 40.
Bannockburn, i. 536.
Baptism, i. 13; its effects, 39, 633; ceremonies accompanying, &c., 167, 178; when given, 252, 627; why in rivers, 54; change in the more usual administration of, 632, *n.*
Barberini, ii. 322.
Bardney, burnt, i. 186.
Bari, synod at, i. 279 *et seq.*
Barlow, a Benedictine, martyred, ii. 329.
Barnaby, Francis, informs against Watson, ii. 273; signs declaration of allegiance, 290.
Barons, the, confederations of, i. 458, 481, 507 *et seq.*, 531.
Barrett, president of Douay, ii. 255; his account of the state of the college at Rome, 261.
Barruel, Abbé, testimony of, concerning the English Catholics, ii. 449.
Basilicas of martyrs, i. 10.
Basing House, siege of, ii. 340.
Basset, John, i. 310.
Basset, Philip, i. 311.
Battle, abbey of, its irregular privileges, &c., i. 330 *et seq.*, 378.
Beaufort, Henry, bishop of Winchester, i. 611 *et seq.*
Bec, abbey of, in Normandy, i. 235, 236, 290.
Beccanceld, synod of, i. 141; another against lay-abbots, 172.
Beccatelli, Pole's biographer, ii. 124, *n.*
Becket, Gilbert, father of St. Thomas, i. 327, 328.
Becket, St. Thomas. See St. Thomas of Canterbury.
Bede, St., nature of his testimony, i. 36, *n.*, and 38, *n.*; 49, *n.*; 91, *n.*; 132, 133, *n.*; 143 *et seq.*; his account of Selsey, &c., not interpolated, 40, *n.*, and 113, *n.*; his childhood, 120, *n.*; what he thought of St. Peter, 41, *n.*; his letter to Egbert of York, 146 *et seq.*; his last occupations and death, 149—151.
Bedingfeld, Sir Henry, "sequestered," ii. 333.
Beggars, supplication of, ii. 50.

Beguines, i. *575.*
Bellamy, family of, at Uxenden, ii. 247.
Benedict XIV., bull of, regulating the missions, ii. 371—373.
Benedictines, the, first introduced into the north by St. Wilfrid, i. 138; and a second time by Aldwin of Winchcomb, 244; their revenues seized by King John, 449; connecting link between the ancient and modern, ii. 302, and *n.*; entrance of, upon the English mission, &c., 303; numbers of, &c., 323; claim of, 357.
Bennet, Bishop, St., accompanies St. Wilfrid to Lyons, i. 75; made the guide of St. Theodore, 88; abbot of St. Peter's, Canterbury, 89; builds Wearmouth and Jarrow, 118, 120; introduces various arts, 119; his pictures, 120; his dying admonitions, 121; his last interview with Sigfrid, and his death, 122.
Bercetfrid, his declaration at the synod on the Nidd, i. 141.
Berengarius, i. 243, *n.*
Berington, Right Rev. Charles, a supporter of the Committee, ii. 394, 407; sudden death of, 408.
Berington, Rev. Joseph, his account of Hawkins, &c., ii. 388, 390; erroneous propositions of, 391 and *n.*
Bermed, bishop of Rochester, i. Appendix C, 630.
Bernard, St., his letter against St. William of York, i. 325.
Bertha, the queen of Ethelbert of Kent, her religion, country, and marriage articles, i. 23.
Berthred, bishop of Lindisfari, i. Appendix C, 630.
Berthwald, archbishop of Canterbury, holds the synod of Onestrefield, &c., i. 137, 139, 140.
Bertin's, St., St. Anselm at, i. 278.
Berton, William de, i. 590.
Bible, copies of both versions of, i. 123; a copy of, as an acceptable present to the Pope, *ib.* See Scriptures.
Billinge, apostasy and miserable death of, ii. 388, 389.
Bingham, Robert, chosen bishop of Salisbury, i. 470.
Birch, president of Sedgley Park, Dr. Milner to, ii. 439.
Birinus, St., sent by Honorius I. to preach to the English, i. 62; consecrated by Aster of Milan, *ib.*; converts Cynegels of Wessex, and fixes his see at Dorchester, in Oxfordshire, *ib.*
Birmingham, Franciscan mission at, ii. 359, *n.*; chapel at, destroyed, 358; going to chapel near, 449.
Bishop, a, his duties, i. 156, 157, 158, 161, 167, 168, 178, 203. See British, Visitation, &c.
Bishops, duties of, to the poor and to prisoners, &c., i. Appendix A; qualifications of, Appendix C. See Vicars Apostolic, &c.
Bishop, Dr. Wm., signs the Declaration of Allegiance, ii. 290; made bishop of Chalcedon, 306; his courage, 307; his chapter, 308.
Blacklce, or White, ii. 354 *et seq.*
Blackwell, George, made archpriest, ii. 265; suspends, &c. rather hastily, 266—269; conduct regarding the two briefs, &c., 299, 301; is deprived, 301.
Blakeburn, or Thompson, prediction of, ii. 243.
Blanchardism, ii. 413, 414 *et seq.*; censures of by the Irish bishops, Appendix M; tests of, 414, 437.
Bloet, Robert, of Lincoln, i. 263.
Blois, count of, i. 395.
Blois, Peter of, i. 414.
Blount, Father, expostulation of, ii. 321.
Blue-books. See Committee, Dr. Milner, &c.
Board, the Catholic, ii, 415—419.
Bocher, Joan, burnt, ii. 114.
Bodenham, "sequestered," ii. 333.
Boderie, his account of Catholic affairs, ii. 297, and 299, *n.*
Boisil, Prior, i. 133.
Boleyn, Anne, ii. 17 *et seq.*, 38; pretended marriage of, 53, 62; execution of, 59.
Bologne, earl of, his sacrilegious marriage, &c., i. 360.
Boniface, St., a monk of Wessex, becomes the apostle of Germany, i. 97; procures from England skilful artists, &c., 153; writes an indignant remonstrance to Ethelbald of Mercia, 153—155; sends to Cuthbert of Canterbury the acts of a German synod, advising him to hold one in England, 155—157.
Boniface IV., St., condemns the revilers of the monks, i. 404.
Boniface V., encourages St. Justus of Canterbury i. 44; his epistle to Edwin of Northumbria, 48.
Boniface VIII., his eulogium of Robert de Winchelsey, i. 528; his explanation of his prohibition of

tallages, 529; appealed to by the Scotch, 532; counter-declaration of the English, and reply of the Scotch, 533.
Boniface IX., declares the statutes of Provisors null, i. 611.
Boniface, archbishop of Canterbury, i. 499; made archbishop by royal influence, 502, *n.*; holds a synod at Lambeth, 502—506; in exile, 508; his death, 512.
Bonner, bishop of London, accused and imprisoned, &c., ii. 109—111; released, 122; again imprisoned, &c., 150, 157, 158.
Book, the King's, ii. 91, 98.
Boseham, Herbert de, account of, i. 330, *n.*, 359; his interview with Henry, 374; his advice to the Canterbury monks, &c., 415, 416.
Bower, an apostate Jesuit, ii. Appendix R, 512.
Bowes, Sir George, his frightful infliction of martial law, ii. 171.
Bradshaw, Sir William, discloses Cecil's schemes against the Catholics, ii. Appendix F, 479.
Bramston, Dr., present, when vicar-general of Dr. Poynter, at the episcopal meeting at Durham, ii. 426; and afterwards at the Holy See, 446; becomes his coadjutor and successor, *ib.*
Brian, martyred, ii. 212.
Bridewell, the king's palace at, ii. 33.
Bristol, earl of, favours toleration, ii. 343.
Bristow of Douay, ii. 179.
Bristow, ii. 215.
Brithnoth, defends the monks, i. 216.
British bishops assisting at the Councils of Arles and Sardica, i. 12.
British Church of St. Martin's, i. 4, 25.
Brito, Richard, i. 386.
Britons, conversion of, i. 3, 4; first persecution of, 7; their evil lives and punishment, 18.
Broc, Philip de, i. 338, 339.
Broc, Randulf de, i. 371, 382, 384, 387, 394, 395.
Brompton, his Chronicle, when written, i. 327.
Broomhead, the missionary at Manchester, ii. 450.
Brown, Lady, Mass at the house of, &c., ii. 183.
Browne, remarks upon his Fasciculus, i. 485.
Bruce, i. 533.
Bruges, Concordat of, i. 565.
Brunehild, the Frankish queen, i. 22.
Bucer, ii. 114.
Buckingham, duke of, treacherous invitation made by, ii. 421.
Buckley, Sigebert or Sebert, ii. 302, and *n.*
Burgh, Hubert de, his opposition to Des Roches, i. 472; suspected of poisoning the earl of Salisbury, 473; triumph and imbecile administration of, 474; his evil use of royal letters patent, 475, 476; his fall and imprisonment, 477.
Burial, a refusal of, to a Catholic, &c., ii. 275.
Burnell, Robert, twice rejected by the Holy See, i. 517.
Burnet, his acknowledged dishonesty, ii. 30, *n.*
Butler, Charles, ii. 374, *n.*, 402; proposes the "Fifth Resolution," &c., 420, 428, 430.
Butler, Alban, ii. 370.
Byrhtelur, archbishop-elect of Canterbury, i. 208.

Caddey, Lawrence, fall of, &c., ii. 230 *et seq.*
Caddy, ii. 207.
Cadwallador, Roger, signs the declaration of allegiance, ii. 290; but dies rather than take the oath of James I., 303.
Cædmon, the cowherd and poet, i. 128 *et seq.*
Cædwalla, an ally of Penda, i. 55, 56, 57.
Cædwalla, of Wessex, depopulates the Isle of Wight, i. 115; gives one-fourth to St. Wilfrid, *ib.*; converted, 136.
Cæmentarius, Alexander, a courtly preacher, i. 451.
Caerleon, its martyrs, i. 7.
Caernarvon, earl of. See Dormer.
Callixtus II., Pope, answer of, to Henry I., &c., i. 302.
Calne, synod at, i. 216.
Calva, Philip de, i. 375.
Calvert, Sir George. See Baltimore.
Camden, the historian, his account of the destruction of monasteries, ii. 88, *n.*; character of the history of, 193, 199, 218, *n.*
Campeggio, Cardinal, his mission to England, ii. 31, 32.
Campion, ii. 18, *n.*, 199—201; preaching of, 201; his Ten Reasons, 203; arrest of, and trial and execution of, 205—211.

Canons, Archbishop Egbert's, i. Appendix A, 626.
Canterbury, dignity of its see, i. 29, *n.*, 109; persecution of the monks of, 406, 412 *et seq.*, 527.
Canute I., son of Sweyn, endeavours to heal the wounds which he had inflicted, i. 225.
Carlisle, St. Cuthbert's visit to, i. 135.
Carmelites, or White Friars, ii. Appendix B, 471.
Casale, Wolsey's instruction to, ii. 34, *n.*
Castlemain, Lord, apology of, ii. 341, *n.*
Catesby, William, devises the Gunpowder Plot, ii. 278.
Catherine of Arragon, ii. 17, &c.; her supplication to Henry, 35; her firmness and persecutions, 40, 41.
Catherine, St., of Sienna, i. 603.
Catholics, the Faith of, the early editions of, censured by Dr. Milner, ii. 431, 442.
Catholics, voluntary exile of, ii. 151, 183, 297. See Recusants, Laws (Penal), &c.
Catholics, afflictions of, during the riots of 1780, ii. 385, and Appendix I.; danger of an actual schism amongst, Appendix L, 498.
Cavarel, Philip de, ii. 323.
Cecil, William, Lord Burghley, ii. 134, 248, 249; tampers with the elections, 146; a party against, &c., 168; instructions of, regarding the Catholics, Appendix F, 479.
Cecil, the Younger, ii. 273, 281.
Cecilian, i. 11, 12.
Cedd, St., sent to preach to the Middle Angles, i. 65; becomes bishop of London, 67; founds monasteries, *ib.*; excommunicates an incestuous thane, 68; foretells the death of Sigbert the Good, *ib.*; builds Lastingham, 69; was there buried, *ib.*
Celestine III., his sentence regarding Hackington church, i. 429, 430.
Celestine V., St., i. 574.
Celnoth, archbishop of Canterbury, professions of obedience to, i. Appendix C, 630.
Ceolfrid, his letter to Naitan, the Pictish king, on the observance of Easter, i. 83; made abbot of Jarrow, 120; and of Wearmouth, 122; brings the old translation of the Bible (vetus Itala), 123; the new translation (St. Jerome's), *ib.*; his character, *ib.*; presents a Bible to the Holy See, *ib.*; his departure for Rome, 124; his death, 125.
Ceolred, i. 155.
Ceolwulf, king of Northumbria, and monk, i. 152, *n.*
Cerularius, Michael, i. 279.
Chad, St., becomes uncanonically bishop in the see of St. Wilfrid, i. 86; his exemplary life, 86, 92; becomes bishop of Lichfield, 90; his vision, last discourse, and death, 93, 94.
Challoner, Bishop, his Memoirs of Missionary Priests, ii. 184, 193 *et seq.*; account of, 364 *et seq.*, 370, 375; death of, 385.
Champney, Dean, circular of, ii. 340.
Champney, Anthony, signs declaration of allegiance, ii. 290.
Chapter, the English, ii. 308, 315.
Charlemagne, patronizes Alcuin, i. 166; refuses to yield up Offa's exiles, sending them to the Holy See, and why, 171, 172.
Charles I., reign and character of, ii. 307, 309, 311, 325—330.
Charles II. at Worcester, ii. 341; proclamation of, *ib.*; yet inclined to toleration, 343.
Charles V., the Emperor, his war with Italy, ii. 21, 26, 31.
Charnwood Forest, the Cistercian Abbey in, ii. 465.
Charta, Magna, confirmed, i. 531.
Chelsea, College at, ii. 4, *n.*
Cheney, of Gloucester, a Lutheran, ii. 155.
Chertsey, founded, i. 143; abbot of, 433.
Chicheley, archbishop of Canterbury, his remissness, &c., i. 609, 613, 614; founder of All Souls, 615.
Christchurch, or St. Saviour's, monastery of, at Canterbury, founded, &c., i. 35; oppression of, by Henry II. and Richard I., and Archbishops Baldwin and Hubert, 407—430, 432.
Christmas Day, the preparation for, i. Appendix A, 626.
Chroniclers, grown courtly, i. 563, 568.
Church, the, amongst the Ancient Britons, its altars and religious, i. 10; its consecration of priests, anointing of kings, doctrines, &c., 10—19; its archiepiscopal see not known by William of Malmesbury, 6, *n.*; Geraldus Cambrensis retracted part of his account of it, *ib.*
Church, the Catholic Church is the

Roman, i. 87, 155; communion with the Roman Church a test of orthodoxy, 12; the "Holy Roman and Apostolic Church," 147; the Church is our Mother, and how, 154; the Roman Church, 159, 160, 167; right of, to free and complete self-government, 461; its gift of the right of patronage, &c., 462 *et seq.*; unity of, 563, 567.
Church, the, condemned propositions concerning power given to, and the head of, ii. Appendix K, 497.
Churches, despoiled, ii. 106; taken from Catholics, 165, 219.
Churches, the Protestant, attendance at, ii. 164, 165, 177, 202, 203, *n.*; punishment for non-attendance, 291, 292 *et seq.*
Cinque Ports, the, an interdict upon, i. 508.
Cistercians (see Fountains, Rievaulx, &c.), poverty of their noble abbeys, &c., i. 431, 246, 437; ii. 469.
Clarendon, Hyde, earl of, ii. 342, 343, *n.*
Clarke, a missionary, persuaded to join Watson's treason, ii. 273, 184, *n.*, 193, *n.*; account of, 364—367; affliction of, 375 *et seq.*, Appendix J.
Claudia Ruffina, i. 6, *n.*
Clement III., his decision against Baldwin of Canterbury, i. 418.
Clement IV., his abortive embassy to England whilst cardinal, i. 508; despatches Ottoboni to England, 509.
Clement V., complaint of Edward I. to, i. 534.
Clement VI., his mediation, i. 548.
Clement VII., ii. 25; negotiations with, on the divorce, 27 *et seq.*, 35; reply of, to the remonstrance, 43; inhibitory and other bulls, &c., against the divorce, 49, 57, 58.
Clement VIII. appoints an archpriest, ii. 265; sweet and prudent reply of, in the case of the appellants against Blackwell, 268; advice of, during the uncertainty regarding Elizabeth's successor, 270.
Clenock, rector of the English seminary at Rome, ii. 196, 251.
Clergy, the Staffordshire, ii. 407.
Clergy, how reverenced, i. 82; state of many of, after Danish invasions, 210, 212, 215, 216; punishments of delinquent, Appendix A, Nos. I. and II.; married, *ib.*; state of, after Norman Conquest, 288, 292, 295, Appendix D; state of, before the Reformation, ii. 8, 9 *et seq.*; opposition of, to Elizabeth's changes, 145, 151, 159 *et seq.*; duties of, i. Appendix A.
Clifford, Lewis, his insolent message, i. 584.
Clitheroe, the family of, confessors, ii. 242.
Clitheroe, field of, i. 314.
Clovesho, synods at, i. 157, 175.
Club, the Cisalpine, ii. 406, 409. See Board (Catholic).
Clugny, St. Anselm at, i. 278.
Cluniac, monks, i. 246, *n.*, 317 and *n.*; deluded, 437; dispersed, 451.
Coifi, an Anglo-Saxon priest of idols, i. 51, *n.*; his speeches at the Witenagemote, 51, 52; declares himself a Christian, and profanes his own temple, 52.
Coinred, king of Kent, i. 139.
Coinwalch, king of Wessex, converted at the court of Anna, king of the East Angles, i. 73; divides Agilbert's diocese, *ib.*; his punishment and repentance, 74.
Coke, ii. 248, 281.
Coldingham, its loss of fervour, and punishment, i. 129 *et seq.*
Colet, dean of St. Paul's, his school, &c., ii. 10—12.
Colleges, the, ii. 410, *n.*, 411. See Douay, &c.
Colleges, &c., suppressed, ii. 105.
Colleton, John, dean, is tried with Campion, &c., and escapes by an alibi, ii. 209; signs the declaration of allegiance, 290; is appointed dean of the chapter, 308.
Collingridge, Dr., ii. 422.
Colman, third bishop of Lindisfarne, his debate with St. Wilfrid at Whitby, i. 72, 76 *et seq.*; withdraws, 81.
Columba, St., his monasteries at Dearmach and Iona, i. 58, 59; converts the Northern Picts, 59; unusual extent of his jurisdiction, *ib.*
Commission, Court of High, ii. 188, 325, 326.
Commissioners, Royal, Report of, on Decay of Population, &c., ii. Appendix AA, 470.
Committee, the, origin of, &c., ii. 389; procures signatures to the Catholic Principles, 390; negotiates for relief, 393; the Declaration and Protestation of, 394 *et seq.*; Protestation, Oath of, 397; the first

Blue Book of, 399; its "Election" and instructions, 401; protest of, 402; change of, into the Cisalpine Club, 406. See Cisalpine Club.
Common Prayer, Book of, ii. 101.
Communion, what, and how often to be received, i. 147, 161, Appendix A. See Viaticum and Real Presence.
Comyn, William, a Scottish chancellor, his violence at Durham, i. 323 *et seq.*
Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Feast of, was it enjoined in England by St. Anselm? i. 296, *n.*; tradition regarding, ii. 102.
Confession, sacramental, i. 134, 155; criminals prevented from receiving, 505, Appendix A, 627, 628.
Confession, the inviolable secrecy of, ii. 282, 284.
Confirmation gives the Holy Ghost, &c., i. 146, *n.*, 231, *n.*
Consanguinity, degrees of, i. 27, *n.*
Constance, Council of, i. 606.
Constantine, Pope, his letter to the English bishops to hold a synod in the scene of St. Ecgwin's vision at Evesham, i. 144.
Constantinople, first, second, and third Councils of, i. 106, *n.*, 107, *n.*
Constantius, general accuracy of, i. 16, *n.*
Conventicle Act, ii. 344.
Conventions, the two, ii. 320.
Conversion of England, when completed, i. 115.
Converts, cautious reception of, ii. 373.
Convocation, ii. 50, 92; remonstrance of, against Elizabeth's changes, 145.
Coombe, the, ii. 345, 346.
Cornwall, Richard, earl of, i. 487. See Richard.
Corporation Act, ii. 344.
Cottam, Thomas, replies of, ii. 216 *et seq.*
Cottington, ii. 322.
Counterpoise, "Supplicatory," &c., ii. 272.
Courtney, William, archbishop of Canterbury, his active zeal, i. 588—590, 613, *n.*
Courtney, Edward, ii. 121.
Courts, Ecclesiastical—Anglo-Saxon, i. Appendix A.
Cox, of Ely, ii. 138, 155.
Cranmer, Thomas, archbishop of Canterbury, attached to the earl of Wiltshire's suite, ii. 42; his oaths and private protest, &c., 55, 56; pronounces the divorce, 56; opposes and then subscribes to the Six Articles, 90, 91; combines with the Seymours, 94, 96; petitions the Crown for jurisdiction, 97; perplexed by Gardiner, 98; pamphlets of, &c., 100, 102; examines Bonner, &c., 110 *et seq.*; his penal code, 116; his arrest and death, 119, 120, 126, and Appendix C, 473.
Crecy, i. 547, 548.
Crediton, see of, i. 198.
Creed, Apostles', to be sung, i. 148. See Apostles' Creed.
Cressy, Serenus, account of, ii. 327, *n.*
Critic, the British, ii. 457 *et seq.*
Cromwell, Thomas, account of, ii. 44; evil advice of, 45 *et seq.*; his sacrilegious spoils, 88; his sudden arrest and execution, 89.
Crook Hall, ii. 411.
Cross, sign of the, i. 83, 109, 125, 147, 169.
Croyland, sack of, i. 187, 188.
Crucifix, the, burning of, &c., ii. 149; to be defaced, 296. See also 183.
Cuichhelm, bishop of Rochester, i. 101.
Curwin, Dr., ii. 57.
Customs, the so-called, i. 506, 522.
Cuthbert, St., the Thaumaturgus of England, i. 133, 143; a monk and missionary, 133, 134; bishop of Lindisfarne, 134; his exhortation and death, 135; his body carried in procession for many years, 185, 186; finally deposited at Durham, which becomes the cathedral in place of Lindisfarne, 186, 247.
Cuthbert, of Canterbury, letter of St. Boniface to, i. 155—157; holds the synod of Clovesho, 157.
Cuthbert's, St., college of, ii. 411.
Cynigils, king of Wessex, his conversion, i. 62; unites with St. Oswald, the Bretwalda, in bestowing Dorchester upon St. Birinus, *ib.*

Dacre, Lord, ii. 170, 172.
Danby, cowardly combination of, with Shaftesbury, ii. 350.
Dandola, his account of the death of Frederick II., i. 468.
Dane-gelt, the, abolished by St. Edward, i. 226.
Danes, the, i. 180 *et seq.*; last great incursion of, 219 *et seq.*, 226, *n.*
Davenant, Sir William, the poet, ii. 327, *n.*
David, St., retrieves discipline

amongst the Britons or Welsh, i. 19; his zeal against Pelagianism, 18, *n.*; his synods, confirmed by the Holy See, become the guide of all the Welsh churches, 19, *n.*
David, King of Scotland, i. 311 *et seq.*
David's, St., see of, Girald Cambrensis's account of, retracted, i. 6, *n.*
Dead, the, prayers for, i. 57, 162, 163, 177 *et seq.*
Declaration, the, and Protestation. See Protestation, the, of the Vicars Apostolic, ii. 446.
Dedication of churches, i. 31, 62. See Church.
Deerhurst, St. Elphege at, i. 216.
Denebert, bishop of Worcester, profession of obedience of, i. Appendix C, 630.
Deposition, the, of princes, ii. 84, 181, 224, 225, *n.*
Deruvian, St. See Fagan, St.
Deusdedit, sixth archbishop of Canbury, and an Englishman, i. 86.
Dialogues, archbishop Egbert's, i. Appendix A, 625, 626.
Diceto, Ralph de, i. 354, 398, *n.*, 399, *n.*
Dickenson, Bishop, procures the rules of the mission, ii. 369.
Dicul, St. Wilfrid's precursor in Sussex, i. 111.
Digby, Sir Everard, declares the Jesuits innocent, &c., ii. 279.
Digby, Sir Kenelm, ii. 354.
Diocletian's persecution, i. 7.
Discipline, as contra-distinguished from faith, i. 83.
Dispensing, power of, in the Holy See, ii. 396, *n.*
Dissenters, Act of Toleration of, &c., ii. 359; efforts of, and call of, upon the Catholics, 394, 395.
Dissenters, "Protesting Catholic," ii. 397, 402, 404.
District, Midland, extent of, ii. 368.
Diuma, an Irish monk, sent together with St. Cedd, &c., to preach to the Middle Angles, i. 65; made bishop of Mercia, 66.
Divorce, when permitted, i. 99; not to be followed by a second marriage, *ib.*
Divorce, the, ii. 27, *n.* See Henry VIII.
Dominic, Father, the Passionist, ii. 459, 460, 464, 465.
Dominicans, i. 489, 570, 572; ii. 323, 465.
Dominis, Anthony de, apostasy of, &c., ii. 304, 512.
Donatists, their origin, i. 11; condemned by the Councils of Rome and Arles, 12.
Donatus, bishop of Dublin, profession of obedience of, i. Appendix C.
Doran, an apostate priest, ii. Appendix R, 512.
Dorchester made an espiscopal see by St. Birinus, i. 62; the see transferred to Lincoln, 489.
Dormer, Robert, earl of Caernarvon, ii. 340.
Douay, seminary at, ii. 178; first priests of, 179; transferred to Rheims, 191; again at, 255; account of, sent to Rome, 372.
Douay, Benedictine college of St. Gregory at, ii. 323.
Douglas, Dr. John, ii. 401; rejects the "Fifth Resolution" in its first form, 420; corrects the Letters to a Prebendary, 440.
Downside, ii. 412.
Doxology, the, i. 151.
Drunkenness, peculiar to Pagans and Anglo-Saxons, i. 157.
Drury, Robert, signs the Declaration of Allegiance, ii. 290; but dies rather than take the oath of James I., 299.
Dublin, bishop of, professes obedience to the archbishop of Canterbury, i. 240, *n.*, Appendix, 630; synod at, ii. 425.
Dunning, advocates the first Catholic Relief Bill, ii. 377, 378.
Dunstan, St., his monasteries in and around Glastonbury, i. 204—206; is exiled by Edwy, 206; returns, and is made bishop of London, 207; chosen archbishop of Canterbury, 208, 209; his private and public life, *ib.*; his efforts to restore the fervour of the clergy, 210; his firmness, 211; his death, 217; appears to Lanfranc, 238, 239.
Dunwich, in East Anglia, made an episcopal see by St. Felix, i. 53.
Durham receives the body of St. Cuthbert, and is ever after the bishop's see in place of Lindisfarne, i. 186, 247; monastery of, from the united houses of Jarrow and Wearmouth, 247—249; decay of the monastic spirit at, ii. Appendix A; meeting at, 426.
Durham, castle of, assaulted, i. 248.

Eadbald, of Kent, his crimes and repentance, i. 42, 43.

Eadbert, of Mercia, i. 165.
Eadbert or Egbert, king of Northumbria, and monk, i. 152.
Eadmer, biographer of St. Anselm, an eye-witness, &c., i. 265, *n.*, 280, 281 *et seq.*; his statement of a plan for removing the monks, &c., 404, *n.*
Eadulf, bishop of York, profession of obedience of, i. Appendix C, 630.
Eadwulf, king of Northumbria, his violent language towards St. Wilfrid, i. 140,
Eanbald, of York, i. 166, 167.
Eanbert or Lanbert, &c. (archbishop of Canterbury), i. 169, 170, 174.
Eanfrid, of Bernicia, his apostasy and murder, i. 56.
Eappa, abbot of Selsey, i. 114.
Eardulf, bishop of Lindisfarne, his flight with the body of St. Cuthbert, i. 185, 186.
Earpwald's conversion and murder, i. 53.
Ease, the Little, ii. 240.
Easter, or the Pasch, when kept by Jews and when by Christians, i. 36; rule for observing, laid down by first Council of Nice, *ib.*; and rejected by the Quartodecimans, 36, 37; improvements in the calculation of, rejected for some time by the Britons, 37; differences regarding, 71; debate on, 76–81.
Eata the Meek, St., abbot of Mailrose and Lindisfarne, i. 82, 133, 134.
Ebroin, the "impious duke" of the Franks, i. 89 and 104.
Ecclesiastics. See Clergy.
Ecgfrid, king of Northumbria, i. 91; induced to persecute St. Wilfrid, 102, 110; his generosity to St. Bennet Biscop, 118, 120; at Farne, 134; is defeated and slain (A.D. 685), 103.
Ecgwin, St., bishop of Worcester and founder of Evesham, i. 143, 144, 145.
Echard, ii. 349, *n.*
Edgar, King, i. 207; his zeal, 210, 214; his undue interference, &c., 211; death, 215.
Edilfrid, of Mercia, his barbarous ravage of Kent, i. 100.
Edmund, St., martyred, i. 190.
Edmund Ironside, i. 225.
Edmund, King, i. 199, 201, 205.
Edmund, St., archbishop of Canterbury, account of, i. 478—480; remonstrates with Henry III., 482, 487; excommunicates him and withdraws to France, where he dies, 487, 488; veneration of Henry III. for, 488.
Edmund's, St., college of, ii. 411.
Edred buys the bishopric of Durham, i. 227; his sudden death, *ib.*
Edric, i. 220.
Education, Catholic children virtually excluded from, by law, ii. 219, 274, 296; to give an, felony, ii. 361.
Edward the Martyr, i. 215, 216.
Edward the Confessor, i. 225—227; the laws of, preferred to those of Henry I., 319; translation of the relics of, 511.
Edward I. taken prisoner, i. 507; escapes and wins battle of Evesham, 509; prepares to head an army of Crusaders, 512; interferes in the freedom of election, *ib.*; his Statutes of Mortmain, 514—517; his wars and tyrannical exactions, &c., 518—534.
Edward II., his misgovernment, &c. i. 535—537; scizes, but at last yields back the lands of the suppressed Templars, 539, 540; his proceedings against the bishop of Hereford, 541; his deposition and death, 542.
Edward III., affliction of his people at the beginning of his reign, &c., 543; his contest with Stratford, 545—547; petition of, ii., Appendix A; is deaf to the Pope's mediation, 548; his anger towards the bishop of Ely, 552 *et seq.*; imprisons those that obey the Holy See, 555, 559, 561; close of his reign, 580—582.
Edward IV., i. 618; his fruitless attempt to nominate to the priory of St. John's, 619.
Edward VI., accession of, &c. ii. 96 *et seq.*; the new service, 101; revolt against, 103; grievances of the people under, ii., Appendix BB, 473; grammar schools of, 105; death of, 116. See Gardiner, Cranmer, &c.
Edward the Black Prince, i. 580, 582.
Edwin, king of Northumbria, extent of his dominions, i. 46; his marriage with Ethelburga of Kent, *ib.*; escape from assassination, 47; his conditional promise to become a Christian, *ib.*; his deliberations, 48; receives a letter from Boniface V., *ib.*; retrospect of early life of, 49; his nocturnal colloquy and promise, 50; his witenagemote at

Godmundham, 51, 52; becomes a Christian, 53; proofs of his zeal, *ib.*; his defeat and death, 55.
Egbert, St. Chad's companion in Ireland, i. 94; his vow, 95; his account of St. Chad's decease, *ib.*; his yearning for the conversion of Germany, *ib.*; not heeding a warning to remain, is shipwrecked, 96; despatches St. Willibrord and his companions, *ib.*; closes his life at Iona, after persuading the monks to keep Easter at the proper time, 82.
Egbert, king of Kent, i. 86.
Egbert, king of Wessex, i. 183.
Egbert, archbishop of York, St. Bede's letter to, i. 146; procures the pallium, &c., 164, 165; canons, &c. of, Appendix A, 626.
Egelric usurps the see of Durham, i. 227.
Elbod, abbot of Benchor, his success in North Wales regarding Easter, i. 84.
Elections, the freedom of, tampered with, ii. 138, 140.
Electors, Letter to, by Sidney Smith, ii. 444, 445.
Elfere, of Mercia, heads a party for Ethelred the Unready, i. 215.
Elfleda, a royal abbess, i. 135.
Elfwold, i. 216.
Elfwy, i. 244, 245.
Elizabeth, Queen, implicated in revolt, ii. 125; her accession, character, &c., 132, 291; punishes White of Winchester for his zealous sermon, 135; arrests several priests, 136; her plans, coronation, and first parliament, 137, 180, *et seq.*; double-meaning words and actions, 149; appropriates lands of bishoprics, 152; her clergy and bishops, 155, 159, 162; excommunication of, &c., 180, 181; attempts of, to ruin Douay College, 191; proclamations of, against the Jesuits, &c., 203, 218, 288; failure of, in attempting to enforce uniformity, 225; her Three and her Thirty-nine Articles, 226; feigned plots against, 233, 234; end of the reign of, 270. See Penal Laws, Campion, Allen, &c.
Ella, i. 185.
Elliott, one of Walsingham's spies, ii. 205.
Ellis, Bishop, one of the first four vicars apostolic, ii. 354, 357.
Elphege, St., first abbot of Bath, i. 216; bishop of Winchester, 213, 216; archbishop of Canterbury, 217, 218; his martyrdom, &c., 220, 224, 254; miracle of the ashen stick, 223, *n.*
Elstow, ii. 57.
Ely sacked, i. 190; restored, 214; made a see, 295.
Emancipation, Act of, ii. 448; oath in act of, Appendix P, 510.
Ember Days, i. 160, Appendix A.
Emigrants, French, ii. 412.
Encyclical of the vicars apostolic condemning the Protestation Oath, &c., ii. 398; second, 402.
Ephesus, Council of, i. 106, *n.*
Equivocation, Coke's distorted account of, repelled by Garnet, ii. 281.
Erasmus, uncatholic tendencies of, ii. 13 and *n.*
Erconwald, St., i. 136, 143.
Ermenburga, Queen, her envy at St. Wilfrid's popularity, i. 91, 102, 110.
Ermenfrid, bishop of Sion, a second time in England as legate for the Holy See, i. 233, 236; some of his proceedings, as too partial to the Conqueror, are annulled by Alexander, ii. 235.
Errington, Rev. William, school of, ii. 364.
Escendune. See Aston.
Espec (d'), Walter, i. 313 *et seq.*
Ethelard, archbishop of Canterbury, i. 172, 174, 175, 183.
Ethelbald, king of Mercia, reproved by St. Boniface, &c., i. 153, 155, 157, 164.
Ethelbert, or Ethelred, king of Northumbria, murdered, i. 154.
Ethelbert, king of Kent, his conference with St. Augustine, i. 24; his liberality, *ib.*; his conversion, 25; dissuaded from persecuting, *ib.*; builds churches, 35, 41; his descendants, 116.
Etheldreda, St., daughter of the good Anna of East Anglia, twice married, yet remains a virgin, retires to Coldingham and becomes abbess of Ely, i. 91, 214.
Ethelred, king of Wessex, his valour, devotion, and death, i. 190, 191.
Ethelred the Unready, i. 219, 220 *et seq.*, 225.
Ethelred, king of Mercia, befriends St. Wilfrid, i. 136, 137, 140.
Ethelred, archbishop of Canterbury, i. 192.
Ethelwold, St., of Winchester, his education, zeal, &c., i. 213—216.

Ethelwulf, king of Wessex, i. 184.
Eucharist, the Holy, reserved for use, &c., i. Appendix A, 627, 628.
Eucharist, i. 169, 633. See Communion, Real Presence, &c.
Eugenius IV., i. 615, 616.
Europe, its fearful calamities towards end of sixth century, i. 20.
Eustace, son of King Stephen, i. 326, 327.
Exequatur, the Royal, not to be permitted, ii. 435.
Expostulation, Dr. Milner's, against Sir J. Hippesley, ii. 437.
Eyre, Lord Mayor, his charity, i. 620.

Fabyan, chronicle of, tampered with, ii. 2.
Fagan and Deruvian, SS., sent by Pope Eleutherius to convert the Britons, i. 3, 4; said, but on very slight reasons, to have founded metropolitan sees, 6, *n.*
Faith, confession of, to the Pope's legate by the Anglo-Saxon Church, i. 107.
Farmer, Richard, persecution of, ii. 89.
Fasting, i. 25, 75, 113, 114, 204.
Fasting Days, i. Appendix A; recent changes regarding, ii. Appendix S.
Faversham, the prior of, i. 419, 420.
Favourite, the popish royal, ii. Appendix EE, 478.
Feckenham, abbot of Westminster, ii. 147, 151; death of, 257.
Felix of Messana, St. Gregory's letter to, i. 27, *n.*
Felix, St., authorized by Honorius of Canterbury to preach to the East Anglians, i. 53; fixes his see at Dunwich, *ib.*; his schools for Latin and his complete success, 53, 54.
Felton, his zeal and death, ii. 181, 182.
Felton, son of the preceding, ii. 240; is forcibly carried to church, &c., 241.
Feraminus, i. 419, 420.
Fields, St. George's, meetings at, i. 599; ii. 383.
Filby, William, ii. 216 *et seq.*
Finan, second bishop of Lindisfarne, i. 65; baptizes Peada of Mercia, *ib.*; consecrates St. Cedd, 67.
Fingal, Lord, ii. 419.
Fisher, John, bishop of Rochester, ii. 24; prosecutions of, 62—64; his last moments, 65—69.
Fisher, one of Walsingham's agents, ii. 251.
Fitzbaldwin, i. 375.
Fitzralph, of Armagh, his rash assertions, i. 576, 577.
Fitzstephen, William, account of, &c., i. 330, *n.*, 354, 358, 391.
Fitzurse, Reginald, i. 386, 388, *et seq.*
Flathers, Matthew, martyrdom of, ii. 301.
Fleury, in Gascony, its abbot receives the profession of St. Odo, i. 202.
Foliot, Gilbert, made bishop of London, i. 336, 350; his advice to St. Thomas, &c., 351, 353; acknowledges how tyrannical the royal courts were, 378, *n.*; his opposition to the monks, 408.
Fools, feast of, interdicted, i. 486.
Ford, Thomas, ii. 179, 186; replies of to the Six Articles, 216.
Foreign, the term inapplicable to the Church, or to the head of the Church, i. 562.
Formosus, Pope, his epistle on the sees not being filled, i. 197.
Forthred, Abbot, i. 165.
Fountains, a Cistercian abbey, how founded, i. 246.
Fox, Richard, bishop of Winchester, ii. 14, *n.*, 20.
Fox, Edward, ii. 27.
Fox, character of his history, &c., ii. 1, 3, *et seq.*; letter of, describing the dissensions among the reformers, Appendix D, 477.
Fratricelli, i. 574.
Frederick II., his ingratitude and tyranny, &c., i. 465—468.
Friars, Franciscan and Dominican, i. 570.
Froude, R. H., ii. 454—456.
Fruidbert, of Hexham, i. 164.
Fruitwald, of Witherne, i. 164.
Fulda, built by St. Boniface, i. 153.
Fuller, ii. 59, *n.*, 312, *n.*
Fyndon, Thomas de, made abbot, but fined by Edward I. for not having asked his leave, i. 523.

Gardiner, Stephen, bishop of Winchester, his embassy to Rome, &c., ii. 27—31, 52, 54; remonstrances of, 98; is imprisoned, 99; demands a trial, and deprived, 113; released by Mary, 121; saves Elizabeth, 125; as chancellor, introduces Pole to the parliament, 127; invites all to imitate his own repentance, 128.
Garnet, Father, arrives in England, ii. 244; arrest, trial, and execution of, &c., 279—285.

Gates, Sir John, his dying speech acknowledging his ill use of the Bible, ii. 120.
Gaveston, i. 536.
Geddes, Dr., ii. 392, 393.
George, St., i. 616, *n.*; ii. 356.
Gerard, bishop of York, i. 286.
Gerard, Father, at Winchester, ii., 243; denounces Watson's treason, 273.
Germanus, or German, St., bishop of Auxerre, is sent to Britain by Pope Celestine, i. 16; gives sight to a blind child, 17; his veneration for relics, *ib.*
Gervase, chronicler, a monk of Canterbury, i. 305, *ns.* 1, 2; 348, *n.*; 390, *n.*
Getmund, of Rochester, i. 101.
Gibson, Dr. Matthew, ii. 390.
Gibson, Dr. William, consecration of, ii. 401; "formula" of, 408; signs the "Fifth Resolution," 423.
Giffard, Bishop, first vicar apostolic of the Midland district, and second of London district, ii. 356.
Giffards, ii. 341.
Gifford, "sequestered," ii. 333.
Gilbert, St., of Sempringham, in Lincolnshire, his school, i. 363; his nuns, lay sisters, and lay brothers, 364; his proposal to the Cistercians, 365; his canons, *ib.*; his sufferings in the cause of St. Thomas, 366; his death, *ib.*
Gildas, a British monk and historian of the sixth century, i. 6, 19.
Gilford, Lady, mass discovered at the house of, ii. 183.
Giraldus Cambrensis, a writer of little judgment, 6, *n.*; his acknowledgment in his retractations, *ib. n.*; his account of the orthodoxy of the Britons or Welsh, 18 and *n.*
Glanville, Randulf de, i. 407.
Glasgow, when made an archbishopric, i. 306, *n.*
Glastonbury, chapel of St. Joseph of Arimathea, thorn-tree and brazen tablets at, i. 2; church founded by the disciples of Christ, 3; made of wicker-work and dedicated to the Mother of God, *ib.*; known as the old church, 4; discovery there of old writings, *ib.* (see St. Dunstan); the last abbot of, ii. 80.
Godmundham, near York, the debate at, concerning the relative merits of paganism and Christianity, i. 51.
Godric, elected abbot amongst the smoking ruins of Croyland, i. 189; his devotion in behalf of the souls in purgatory, 190.
Godric, St., his pilgrimages and his penitential toil at Finchale, i. 400, 401.
Godwin on Formosus's epistle, i. 198, *n.*; his statement regarding St. Odo, 201, *n.*
Goisfrid, i. 238.
Goldwell, bishop of St. Asaph's, endeavours to return to England, ii. 264.
Goodman, of Gloucester, ii. 293, *n.*
Goodman, magnanimity of, ii. 328, 329.
Gordon, Lord George, ii. 383.
Goring, ii. 340.
Gospel history, pictures illustrative of, i. 120.
Gother, converts Challoner, &c., ii. 364, 365.
Gothrun, i. 187.
Grammar-schools, ii. 105.
Grand, Le, ii. 31, *n.*
Gregory, St., the Great, his zeal, i. 21; is touched at the appearance of some English slaves, *ib.*; sends St. Augustine to convert the English, *ib.*; encourages him and his companions to complete their journey to England, 22; lays down directions for the application of offerings and the method of life of the bishops, 26; for compiling a body of canon law, 27; for punishments, *ib.*; for repressing the Anglo-Saxon or English custom of marrying near relatives, 27, 28; and for regulating St. Augustine's connection with the neighbouring bishops, 28; he sends relics and the pallium, &c., 29.; his plan for the establishment of sees, 29, 30, *n.*; his advice regarding the temples of idols, 31; his joy at the rapid progress of conversion, 32; his advice to St. Augustine on hearing of the miracles of the latter, 33; his death, 34; his festival, 160.
Gregory VII., the Conqueror's reply to, i. Appendix B; calls the monks of Jarrow, &c. to Durham, 249; his death, 266.
Gregory IX., his remonstrance, i. 476; orders and enforces a general visitation, 477, 478; appoints St. Edmund Rich to the see of Canterbury, 478; his death, 492.
Gregory XI. rebukes the English bishops, i. 582.
Gregory XII., i. 603, 605; resigns, 606.
Gregory XIII. erects a college for the English, ii. 195.

Gregory XV. appoints a bishop for Great Britain, ii. 306.
Grenville, Earl, vexation of, at the declaration of the Irish bishops, ii. 418; plans of, &c., 419, 420.
Grey, Earl, and the board, ii. 420.
Griffiths, Dr., account of, ii. 462.
Grim, i. 391; his biography of St. Thomas how to be made to harmonize with Gervase and Fitzstephen, 390, *n.*
Grindal, of Salisbury, ii. 114, 138.
Grissold, heroic constancy of, ii. 276.
Grocyn, ii. 11, 12.
Grostête, Robert, bishop of Lincoln, his zeal, difficulties, &c., i. 484—496; encourages Simon de Montford, 503, *n.*; last acts of, 497.
Gualo, a cardinal-legate, as guardian of Henry III., restores England to peace, i. 458, 459.
Guitmund, his reply to William the Conqueror, i. 242, 243.

Hackington, or Haketon, attempt to build a cathedral church at. See Baldwin of Canterbury.
Haketon, Simon de, i. 471.
Halfdane, i. 187.
Hales, Alexander, i. 572.
Hales, monastery of, its relics, ii. 82.
Hales, Colonel, trial of, for refusing the test, ii. 353.
Hall, Edward, his history, ii. 1, and 17, *n.*
Hampden, Dr., ii. 457.
Hanover, house of, address of Catholic allegiance to, ii. 376.
Hanse, Everard, martyred, ii. 191.
Harold II., i. 233.
Harpsfeld, remarks of, concerning the bishops before the Reformation, ii. 8; reprimanded for his zeal, 136; present at the Westminster discussion, 147.
Harrison, third and last archpriest, ii. 306.
Hastings, the Dane, i. 195, 196.
Havard, discourse of, at the funeral of Dr. Poynter, ii. 447.
Hawkins, an apostate, &c., ii. 388.
Hay, Bishop, ii. 369, *n.*, and 391.
Hayward, Sir John, ii. 59; his account of several bishops under Edward VI., 113, *n.*
Hearne, the editor of various historical works, his opinion regarding the relic of Hales Abbey, ii. 83.
Heath, bishop of Worcester and then of York, ii. 112, 133, 135, 150.
Henlip, famous for hiding-places, &c., ii. 279.
Henrietta, queen of Charles I., ii. 309, 319, 328.
Henry IV., emperor of Germany, his violence against the Church, i. 260, *n.*, and 266.
Henry, bishop of Winchester, holds a synod as legate, i. 309; treats with Matilda, &c., 319, 320; his transactions regarding the see of York, 322—325; consecrates St. Thomas of Canterbury, &c., 336, 342, 351.
Henry I., his charter, i. 283; claims investitures, customs, &c., 283 *et seq.*; yields, 294; resumes his claims, 300 *et seq.*
Henry, son of David of Scotland, i. 315.
Henry II., of France, busy against Elizabeth, ii. 137.
Henry II., his accession, &c., 327; his character, 329; his overbearing deportment at the great council at Colchester, 332 *et seq.* (see St. Thomas of Canterbury); unchristian scheme of, &c., 406 *et seq.*; death of, 421.
Henry the Younger, i. 375 *et seq.*
Henry III., his minority, i. 458, 459 *et seq.*; his attempts to present, 470, 471; his favouritism, &c., 474, 481—483, 486 *et seq.*, 493, 495.
Henry IV. professes to defend the Church's freedom, &c., i. 596, 607, 609.
Henry V. attempts to reason with Oldcastle, i. 598; seizes the rebels at St. Giles's Fields, &c., 599, 600; promises to submit to Parliament the Pope's remonstrances, 611, 614—617.
Henry VI., trial regarding the title of, &c., i. 617, 618.
Henry VII., i. 618.
Henry VIII., i. 618; marriage of, &c., ii. 17; first thoughts of the divorce, 17, 18, 25; first plan of, for securing the divorce, 26; the two embassies to Rome, 27 *et seq.*; vexation of, at not at once obtaining the divorce, 31; his reception of Campeggio, 32; his fright at the sweating sickness, *ib.*; his address to the citizens, 33; his duplicity, 34 *et seq.*; his vengeance upon Wolsey, &c., 38, 40; requires from the clergy an acknowledgment that he is supreme head, and a promise to make no more constitutions, 45—48, 50—52; his conditional excommunication and schismatical appeal, 57, 58; marries Lady Jane

Seymour, 59; his urgent injunctions against those that were zealous for the supremacy, 73; is excommunicated conditionally, 84, 85; marries Anne of Cleves, 88; codes of doctrines promulgated by, 90—92; his last measures, and death, 93, 94; his interested panegyrists, 94, 95.
Herbert, bishop of Thetford or Norwich, i. 286.
Herbert de Boseham. See Boseham.
Herbert, Lord, the biographer of Henry VIII., ii. 82, *n.*
Herbert, Lord Chief Justice, decision of, on the dispensing power, ii. 253.
Hereford, i. 589 *et seq.*
Herefordshire, stress of persecution in, ii. 275.
Herefrid, i. 135.
Heresfrid, a priest, i. 153, 155.
Heresies, from the third to the eighth century, i. 106, *n.*, 107. See also Donatists, Arianism, Pelagianism, Luther, &c.
Heretics, how regarded in the first ages of the Church, ii. 11.
Herluin, abbot of Bec, i. 235.
Herst, Richard, martyred, ii. 311.
Hertford, synod at (A.D. 670), i. 97—100.
Hertford. See Somerset.
Hexham, dedication of its church, i. 91; privileges and dangers of, 310, 316.
Heylin, ii. 107, *n.*
Hierarchy, the, ii. 462—464.
Hii. See Iona.
Hilary, bishop of Chichester, his contest with the abbot of Battle Abbey, &c., i. 331 *et seq.*, 341, 357, 358, 378 *et seq.*
Hilda, St., abbess of Whitby, i. 75, 76, 129.
Hippesley, Sir John, ii. 430; urgent proposal of, &c., 436.
Holden, ii. 354 and *n.*; and Appendix FF.
Holingshed, character of his Chronicle, &c., ii. 1.
Holtby, Father, receives the brief of Paul V., &c., ii. 299, 301.
Holte, ii. 10.
Honorius I., commands St. Paulinus to consecrate Honorius of Canterbury, i. 54; his letter on the time of Easter, 72.
Honorius III., his explanation of "provisions," &c., i. 464, 469.
Honorius, fifth archbishop of Canterbury, is consecrated at Lincoln by St. Paulinus, i. 55; his veneration for St. Aidan, 72.
Hooker, Holingshed's continuator, ii. 7.
Hooper accuses Bonner, ii. 109; invades the see of Worcester, 112, 113.
Hopton, Owen, villany of, ii. 229—231.
Hornyold, Bishop, ii. 364; account of, 367—371.
Horse-racing, i. 160.
Horsea, Hugh de, i. 393.
Hospitallers, Knights, i. 539, 540, 619; ii. 471.
Hospitals, under whose control, &c., i. 633; ii. Appendix BB, 471.
Hotel, Doran's, the treacherous dinner-party at, ii. 420, 421.
Hours, canonical, i. 159.
Howard, Cardinal, ii. 350 *n.*, and 355.
Hubert, bishop of Salisbury, elected, at the suggestion of Richard, to the see of Canterbury, i. 429; his oppression and disobedience, 432; compelled by Innocent III. to resign his office of royal justiciary, 437; wins the consent of the monks to the erection of a church at Lambeth, 439; dies, 444.
Hubert, a legate, i. 236; admonishes William the Conqueror to do homage and pay certain moneys to St. Gregory VII., i. Appendix B.
Huddlestones, ii. 341, 352.
Hugh, bishop of Chester, or Lichfield and Coventry, i. 425. See Nonant.
Hugh, St., of Lincoln, his miracles and funeral, i. 441—444.
Hugo, archbishop of Lyons, i. 278.
Huicci, the Britons living in and near the valley of the Severn, between Gloucester and Worcester, &c., i. 35 *et seq.*
Huns, i. 180.
Hussey, Dr., ii. 401.
Hyde. See Clarendon.

"Ideal," the, "of a Christian Church," ii. 459.
Idolatry, punishment of, i. Appendix A, 626.
Ignatius, St., desire of, to assist England, ii. 198.
Images, destroyed, ii. 81.
Imma, a thane, his chains miraculously broken, i. 126—128.
Independents, despotism, of, ii. 326; bitterness of, 330.
Ingulf, i. 190, *n.*
Innocent III., his sentence regarding Lambeth church, i. 433, 437, 438;

protects Frederick II., 465; his reception of the three deputations, 444, 445; consecrates Stephen Langton, 446; having in vain endeavoured to induce John to receive him, he imposes an interdict upon all England, 446—449; sends two legates to John, 452; pronounces sentence of deposition against him, 454; confirms part of John's charter of free election, 457; his unusual exercise of the plenitude of power, intended to meet the exigencies of the late interdict, 463.
Innocent IV. holds the Council of Lyons, &c., i. 467; is petitioned upon certain alleged grievances, 494; gives audience to Grostête, 496; his reply to some complaint, 496, 497.
Innocent VI., remonstrance of, against the violence of Edward III., i. 558; gives audience to John of Shoreditch, 559; his reiterated remonstrance, 560.
Innocent XII., decree of, ii. 372.
Institute, the godly and pious, ii. 90; the free, of the clergy, 441.
Institutions, charitable, ii. Appendix BB, 471.
Instructions, what kind of, to be given to the people, i. 146.
Insurrections, against the tyranny of Henry VIII., ii. 77, 78; against the new service of Edward VI., 103; against Elizabeth, 169—172.
Interdict, Mercia subjected to, i. 178 and *n.*; imposed upon all England, 448 *et seq.*; a partial, 508.
Investitures, i. 281, 283—286, *et seq.*
Iona. See St. Columba, &c.
Ireland, the only tranquil spot in Europe, i. 20; resorted to by English students, 73, 94; the sees of, how far subject to Canterbury, 240, *n.*, and Appendix C, *n.*; state of, in '98, 415, 416; alarm of the bishops of, after receipt of Quarantotti's rescript, ii. 435; resolute attitude of, previous to emancipation, 443, 444. See Dublin.
Islip, Simon, archbishop of Canterbury, i. 544, 569, 570.

James, St. Paulinus's deacon, still living in the time of St. Bede, i. 49, *n.*; his zeal and his skill in plain chant, 58; present at the Whitby conference, 76.
James I., accession of, ii. 270; selfishness of, &c., 272; oath of allegiance of, &c., 292 (see Allegiance); the Spanish match, 307; summary of the reign of, 309.
James II., projects against, whilst duke of York, ii. 347 *et seq.*; too hasty zeal of, 352 *et seq.*; his general toleration, 353.
Jarrow (see St. Bennet Biscop, St. Bede, &c.), restored, i. 245; left, 249.
Jaruman, bishop of Mercia, his preaching in Essex, i. 70.
Jenks, Roland, pestilence at the trial of, ii. 184.
Jennison, an apostate Jesuit, ii. Appendix R.
Jesuits, first sent into England (see Campion and Persons), pretended plots of, ii. 203, 218 *et seq.*; excepted from proposed relief, 343; not to intermeddle in politics, 222 (see Persons, Campion, Garnet, &c.); restoration of the society of the, 452 and *n.*
Jewell, of Salisbury, ii. 3, 147, 155.
Jocelin, bishop of Salisbury, excommunicated, i. 371.
Jocelin de Arundel, i. 383 *et seq.*
John, the archcantor of St. Peter's, his mission to England, i. 105, 109, 110, *n.*, 119.
John of Beverley, St., bishop of Hexham and then of York, i. 141, 143; his miracles and his school, 143, and *n.*
John IV., writes to the Irish, &c., on the time of Easter, i. 72.
John VIII., his letter to Ethelred of Canterbury, i. 192, 193.
John XXII., his bull against the spirituals, i. 573; excommunicates Louis of Bavaria, 575.
John, King, assists at St. Hugh's funeral, i. 443; his attempt to procure the election of John of Norwich, &c., 444 *et seq.*; expels the monks of Christchurch, 446; refuses to receive Cardinal Langton as archbishop of Canterbury, and is punished with a general interdict, 446—450; is deaf to the advice of his German relatives, 450; his tyranny, 450, 451 *et seq.*; his deposition and submission, 454 *et seq.*; his charter of freedom of election, 457.
John of Cretna, legate, i. 305; his character, *ib.*, *n.* 1.
John of Salisbury, i. 343, 373.
John of Oxford, excommunicated, i. 371.
John of Anagni, legate, i. 429.

Johnson, Robert, replies of, ii. 216 *et seq.*
Johnson, an historian of the times of James I., ii. 271, 272, *notes*.
Joseph, St., of Arimathea, the tradition of the arrival of, at Glastonbury, i. 1—5.
Journal, the Orthodox, ii. 439.
Judges, their duties, i. 168.
Julius II., ii. 25.
Jurisdiction, ecclesiastical, pretended to be obtained from the crown, ii. 97; continuance or cessation of, 312 *et seq.*; of religious, 37; errors of Berington and committee upon, 391, *n.*, 399.
Justices, punishment of, if they did not enforce the act of Royal Supremacy, ii. 166.
Justus, St., one of St. Augustine's co-operators, i. 29; made bishop of Rochester, 41; made archbishop of Canterbury, 44; his patience, *ib.*; receives the pallium, *ib.*; dies, 54.

Keble, ii. 456.
Kellison, president of Douay College, ii. 305.
Kemble, martyrdom of, ii. 351.
Kemp, cardinal, and archbishop of Canterbury, i. 613; school founded by, at Wy, ii. Appendix BB, 471.
Kenelm, St., i. 179.
Kennet, of Peterborough, ii. 343, *n.*
Kenulf, of Mercia, petitions Leo III. to restore to the see of Canterbury its former prerogatives, i. 173 *et seq.*; his violence against Wulfrid of Canterbury, 178, 179.
Ket, Robert, the tanner, ii. 103.
Kettel, his insight into the spiritual world, i. 402.
Kilwardby, Robert de, archbishop of Canterbury, his firmness against pluralists, i. 510, 513 and *n.*, 517, 572.
Kings, their anointing, i. 10; the obedience they owe to bishops, 168; their duties, 203.
Kingstot, Richard de, elected chancellor of the university of Oxford, i. 523.
Kirby, Luke, replies of, ii. 216 *et seq.*; conversation of, with Nichols, the informer, 230.
Kirk, Dr., ii. 408.
Kitchin, bishop of Llandaff, ii. 150.
Knight, an agent of Henry VIII., ii. 34, *n.*
Knighton, i. *n.* to pp. 583, 585, 592, 595, 597.
Knowles, Sir Francis, ii. 212.
Knox, ii. 114.

Lahaie, Matilda, starved to death by King John, i. 451.
Lambeth, attempt to build a cathedral church at, i. 428, 432, 439; synods of, 502 *et seq.*, 518.
Lancaster, John of Ghent, duke of, i. 581, 582, 583, 591, 592, *n.*
Lands, Catholics not to purchase, ii. 360.
Lanfranc, archbishop of Canterbury, his earlier life, i. 235 and 236; his desponding letter to the Holy See, 236; rebuilds his cathedral, 237; his contest with Odo, earl of Kent, 237, 238; and his visions and cure, 238—240, and *n.* to 239; goes to Rome for the pallium, 241; his error in restoring Thomas of York, &c., 242; holds synods, and abolishes the see of St. Martin's, 253; his conversation regarding St. Elphege, 223, *n.*, 254, 255; his constitutions, 249; defence of the monks, 405; his death, 257.
Langton, Cardinal, consecrated archbishop of Canterbury by Innocent III., i. 446; is refused admission by King John, 446, 452; his fruitless appeal against Nicholas, the legate, 463.
Lanigan, Dr., his explanation of Donatus's profession of obedience, i. 240, *n.*
Lastingham, its erection and present appearance, i. 69. See SS. Cedd and Chad.
Latimer, bishop of Worcester, his coarse eloquence and versatility, ii. 71, 91; preaches at the burning of Dr. Forest, 81; accuses Bonner, 109; his death, 126.
Latin, as a means of civilizing and instructing in spiritual things, i. 53, 147; when not understood, how to be sung, 161 and 162.
Lawrence, St., one of St. Augustine's fellow-labourers, i. 29; second archbishop of Canterbury, 41; scourged by St. Peter, 43; writes to the Irish and Britons upon the observance of Easter, 72.
Layman, a, rash expressions in the "Letter by," ii. 400.
Laymen, not to teach, &c., i. 627.
Leander, Father, ii. 318; report of, concerning the mission, 322—324; further account of, 323, *n.*
Learning, state of, in eighth and ninth centuries, i. 183; in fifteenth

and sixteenth centuries, ii. 10—12.
Lee, Rowland, of Lichfield and Coventry, ii. 53 and 54.
Lee, Edward, archbishop of York, ii. 54.
Legates. See St. German, Virgilius of Arles, John the archcantor, Pope Adrian, St. Boniface, Ermenfrid, Walter, &c. &c.
Leicester, earl of, ii. 235.
Leinster, opinion of the bishops of, regarding the veto bill of 1821, ii. 438.
Leo III., Pope, restores to Canterbury its prerogatives, i. 174.
Leo X., ii. 25.
Leofgar, the unworthy bishop of Hereford, i. 228.
Leutherius, bishop of Wessex, and nephew of Bishop Agilbert, i. 74, 97.
Lewes, battle of, i. 507.
Lewetot, or Luvetot, Richard de, i. 324.
Lewis, Owen, petition of, concerning the English college at Rome, ii. 195; application of, 196, 197.
Leyburn, Bishop, the first of the four vicars apostolic, ii. 354—356.
Libraries amongst the Anglo-Saxons, by whom founded, and where, &c., i. 165 *et seq.*; wanton destruction of, ii. 86, 87, 88, *n.*
Ligulf, or Liulf, i. 247.
Lilye, ii. 10, 12.
Lincoln, see of, too large, &c., i. 295.
Lincoln made an episcopal see in place of Dorchester, i. 489; fair of, 458, 472; canons of *v.* their bishop, 489, 490.
Lincoln's Inn Fields, assemblies of Catholics near, ii. 451.
Lindisfarne (see St. Aidan, &c.), sack of, i. 181, 185.
Lingard, Dr., replies to Shute of Durham, ii. 426; Dr. Milner's animadversions upon the History of England by, 442.
Lisbon, beginnings of English college at, ii. 255, 372.
Litanies. See Rogation-days.
Litta, Cardinal, to Dr. Milner, ii. 434, *n.*; document of, directed to Dr. Poynter, 435.
Littlemore, ii. 459, 460.
Liverpool, Lord, obliged to treat with the leaders of the Irish Catholics, ii. 444.
Lloyd, Dr., tutor of Newman, &c., ii. 254.
Lollards, or Wickliffites, i. 578, 589, 590; their libels and turbulence, 593—600; their forgeries, 601; punishments of, 595, 596; petitions against, 594, 597.
London, its bishop at Arles, i. 12 and *n.*; dignity of its see, 29, 30 and *n.* (see St. Mellitus, St. Cedd, Vini, &c.); synod at, 251, 252; revolts of, &c., 507, 511, *n.*, 531; fire of, falsely attributed to the Catholics, ii. 344.
Longbirch, ii. 368, 370.
Lord's Day, the, i. 159.
Louis VII. of France, his hospitality to St. Thomas, &c., i. 361, 371 *et seq.*, 381, 395.
Louis, Prince, afterwards Louis VIII. of France, his alliance with the revolted barons of King John, i. 458.
Louis of Bavaria, encourages schism, &c., i. 574—576.
Lucca, the bishop of, i. 281.
Lucius, King, his letters to Pope Eleutherius, i. 3.
Luna, Peter de, or Benedict XIII., i. 603, 605, 606.
Luther, Martin, account of, ii. 21—24.
Lyford, Campion's arrest at, ii. 205.
Lylde, Thomas de, bishop of Ely, his character, unjust prosecutions, and appeal to Rome, i. 550—556.
Lyne. Mrs. Anne, martyrdom of, ii. 243.
Lynwode, ii. 10, *n.*

Macarthy, Dean, ii. 426.
Macdonald, Sir Archibald, ii. 404.
Mahometans, their successful inroads upon the Christians, i. 465, 466.
Mailros or Melrose (see St. Eata, St. Cuthbert, Aldwin, &c.), i. 246.
Maine, Cuthbert, the Douay protomartyr, ii. 185—188.
Maitland, his exposures of Hume and Robertson, and the Puritan writers of the Reformation, ii. 7; his account of the general tone of Catholic writers, 23, *n.*
Malmesbury, its first abbots, i. 84.
Malony, John Baptist, imprisoned for life for being a priest, ii. 375.
Mandeville, Geoffrey de, i. 321.
Manning, ii. 367.
Manslaughter of priests or relations, i. 629.
Margaret, St., of Scotland, i. 310, 311.
Margaret's, St., parish church, included in the exempt jurisdiction of Westminster Abbey, i. 511.
Marisco, Richard de, bishop of Durham, i. 470.
Marmion, Robert, i. 321.

Marriage, i. 27, 99 *et seq.*; ii. 369, 410.
Martin's, St., church of, i. 4, 25 *et seq.*; see of, suppressed, 253.
Martin V., election of, i. 606; his letters, &c. against the Provisor statutes to Henry Beaufort, the bishop of Winchester, and to Chicheley of Canterbury, 611—615.
Martin, Gregory, learning of, &c., ii. 179.
Martinegi, Pius IV.'s legate to Elizabeth, ii. 163.
Martyr, ii. 114.
Mary I., her claim, &c., ii. 117—120; her laws, 122, 123 (see Gardiner and Pole); her courage, 124, *n.*
Mary, queen of Scots, ii. 117, 167—170; scheme of Walsingham against, and death of, 233—237.
Mary's, St., college of, at Oscott, ii. 411.
Mass, i. 10, 25, 114 *et seq.*; how salutary both for body and soul, 128; a sacrifice, 626; where offered, 627; sung in English, ii. 100; stringent law of the Commonwealth against persons attending, 331; reward to the informer who could convict any one of saying, 361.
Mass, where said, ii. 340.
Matilda, the empress, i. 307, 310, 319.
Matrimony, i. 27, 28, 99, Appendix D, 633.
Matthews, Sir Toby, ii. 327, *n.*
Mellent, De, earl, i. 277, 278.
Mellitus, St., one of St. Augustine's fellow-labourers, i. 29; is made bishop of London, 41; brings from Rome the Pope's letters in favour of the monks, 404; his reply to King Saberct, 42; his banishment, 43; becomes archbishop of Canterbury, 44; extinguishes a conflagration by his prayers, *ib.*; dies, *ib.*
Menandrinus, Marsilius de, i. 575.
Mepham, Simon de, i. 570.
Mercurianus, Campion's letter to, ii. 204.
Mettam, Thomas, detention of, at Wisbeach, &c., ii. 258, 259.
Middleton, Conyers, replied to, by Challoner, ii. 365.
Milner, Right Rev. John, life of Bishop Hornyold by, ii. 368, *n.*; remark of, upon Wesley as compared with O'Leary, 383; remarks of, on Joseph Berington, 392; and on the Protestation oath, 396, *n.*; employed as agent of the bishops, 403; consecrated, &c., 409, 410; efforts of, against the Blanchardists, 413, 414; hesitation at first regarding the veto, 417; attempts to shake the resolution of, 420, 421; at St. Alban's tavern, 422; thanked by the Irish bishops, 425; apologises at the Durham meeting, 426; his account of the rejected bill of 1813, 428, 429; censures two works written by priests, 431; reception of, at the Holy See, 433; expostulation of, 437; opposition of, to the last Veto bills, 438, 439; death and character of, 439 *et seq.*; regard of, for Dr. Poynter reciprocated, 437, *n.*
Milo, earl of Hereford, i. 319.
Milo, Crispin, remarks on his life of Lanfranc, i. 233, *n.*
Miracles wrought at St. Alban's tomb, i. 9; by St. German, 17; by St. Augustine, &c., 25 and *n.*, 33, 38, 54, 57.
Missionaries, duties of, &c., ii. 222, 290, 336; a large number of conveyed to France, 245.
Missionary priests, memoirs of. See Challoner.
Mitford, ii. 404.
Monasteries, the double, i. 130; feigned, 148; rebuilt, 209, 212—214; suppression of, ii. 77, 80, 86; decay of discipline in, 76, *n.*, Appendix A, 469; number and revenues, &c., Appendix B, 470.
Monks, bound by voluntary vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, i. 10 *et seq.*; compulsory service of, 157; rules for, 160, 204; to be well tried before admission, 161; not more in one community than can be easily supported, 162, 163; dress of, &c., 163; life of, 249; efforts against, 404 *et seq.* See Benedictines, Cistercians, Canterbury, &c.
Monmouth, Catholic traditions in the neighbourhood of, ii. 351 and *n.*
Montague of Chichester, narrow escape of, ii. 327.
Montague, Walter, ii. 327, *n.*
Montague, Viscount, opposes Bill of Supremacy, &c., ii. 145, 146.
Montfort, Simon de, marries the widow of the earl-marshal, and quarrels with her brother Henry III., i. 486, 487, 507—509.
More, Henry, S. J., his history, ii. 197, *n.*
More, Sir Thomas, replies to Luther, ii. 24; opinion on the divorce, &c.,

26 ; defends the clergy and religious, 50 ; his devout practices, &c., 63 ; his imprisonment, 64; trial and death, 65 *et seq.*, 69.
Moreville, Hugh de, i. 386 *et seq.*
Morgan, ii. 232 *et seq.*, 251 *et seq.*
Morison, vile flattery of, ii. 94.
Morley, Lord, mass discovered at the house of, ii. 183.
Mortmain, statutes of, i. 514—517; protest against, and censure of, by the Pope, 515, *n.* ; clergy's petition against, 525.
Morton, archbishop of Canterbury, ii. 9.
Morton, N., canon, ii. 170.
Movement, "the Oxford," ii. 453—460.
Moylan, Dr., deputed by the Irish bishops to restore harmony, ii. 425 *et seq.*
Munden, a confessor, ii. 238, 239.
Murdac, Henry, abbot of Fountains, made archbishop of York, i. 325, 326.
Mush, John, signs the Declaration of Allegiance, ii. 290 ; counsels Blackwell, 301.

Naiton, king of the Picts, instrumental in leading his subjects to the right observance of Easter, i. 82 ; his love for Rome, 83.
Napoleon I., ii. 412.
Nau, secretary of Mary, queen of Scots, ii. 232, 233, *n.*, 236, *n.*
Nelson, John, martyred, ii. 188—190.
Nennius, of little historical value, i. 6.
Neot, St., reproves his kinsman Alfred the Great, i. 192, 193 ; foretells his punishment, 194.
Newburgh, William of, i. 340.
Newgate, Old, ii. 240, 249.
Newman, Dr., as a student, ii. 454; influenced by Froude, 455 ; unites with Keble, &c., 456 ; writings and sermons of, 457, 458 ; establishes a community at Littlemore, 459 ; embraces the faith, 460 ; present labours of, *ib.*
Newport, Salop, approach to the chapel near, ii. 449.
Nice, first general council of, condemns Arius, i. 13 ; regulates the time of Easter, 36.
Nicholas II., his firmness, i. 229.
Nicholas III., his definition, i. 573.
Nicholas, bishop of Tusculum, receives the golden bull of John's fealty to the Holy See, i. 456 *et seq.*
Nicholas, a legate, his unusual powers, i. 463.
Nichols, the informer, ii. 228—231.
Nidd, the, synod at, i. 140, 141.
Ninian, St., a Briton, sent by the Holy See to preach to the southern Picts, i. 59.
Noailles, his wicked and short-sighted policy, ii. 123.
Nonant, Hugh de, his persecution of the monks of Coventry, and his death, i. 439, 440.
Norfolk, dukes of, ii. 93, 94, 121, 168.
Northallerton (see Standard), burnt, i. 536.
Northampton, great council at, i. 349.
Northumberland, earl of, his insurrection and death, ii. 169—172.
Northumberland, the duke of, his ambition and death, ii. 117—120.
Northumbria, conquered by the Danes, i. 185.
Nuns, injunctions for, i. 160, 163.

Oates, Titus, ii. 348 *et seq.*
Oath to serve on the mission, ii. 336—339.
Oath, Protestation, ii. 397 ; and condemnation of, 398 ; the theological of 1813, 428.
Oath at consecration, &c. of bishops, i. 347 ; of allegiance (see Allegiance).
Obedience, professions of, to the metropolitan, i. Appendix C.
Obligation, changes regarding the days of, ii. Appendix S.
Occam, the English Franciscan, i. 573, 574.
O'Connell, Daniel, ii. 443.
Odo, St., i. 200 ; his constitutions, 202—204.
Odo, bishop of Bayeux, and earl of Kent, his oppression of the church of Canterbury, i. 237.
Odo, prior of Christchurch, Canterbury, i. 398.
Œcolampadius, ii. 23.
Œgelric, bishop of Chichester, skilled in Anglo-Saxon laws, i. 238.
Offa, king of Mercia, i. 167, 169 ; his efforts to make Lichfield an archiepiscopal see, and why, 170 ; murders Ethelbert, 171 ; his penance, &c., *ib.*
Offerings, their division into four portions, i. 26.
Oglethorp, bishop of Carlisle, forbidden to elevate the Blessed Sacrament, ii. 139 ; crowns Elizabeth and dies of grief, 140, 151.

Oils, holy, for anointing the sick, i. Appendix A.
Oldcastle, Sir John, his Lollardism, turbulence, and death, &c., i. 598—600.
Oldcorne, Father, capture of, &c., ii. 280; death of, 286.
Old Hall, St. Edmund's College, ii. 411, 465.
O'Leary, Arthur, replies of, to Wesley, &c., ii. 380, *n.*, 382.
Oliva, Peter John, the leader of the Fratricelli, i. 574.
Omer's, St., college at, ii. 256.
Onestrefield, synod of, and St. Wilfred's second appeal, i. 137.
Oraria, what, i. 151, *n.*
Oratorians, the, ii. 460.
Ordinances, of the Commonwealth, ii. 330 *et seq.*
Ordination, Parker's, ii. 153 *et seq.*
Original sin, i. Appendix D.
Orleton, Adam de, bishop of Hereford, i. 541.
Orthodox. See Journal.
Osborn, prior of Christchurch, deposed, i. 429.
Osbert, i. 185.
Oscott, Old, Dr. Milner's chapel of the Sacred Heart at, ii. 441.
Oscott, St. Mary's College at, ii. 411, 441.
Osmund, St., his repentance for opposing St. Anselm, i. 274; inquiry into his miracles, 470.
Osmund, bishop of Salisbury, his repentance, i. 274.
Osred, king of Northumberland, i. 140, 152, 155.
Osric, of Deira, his apostasy and death, i. 56.
Oswald, St. and Bretwalda, his descent, i. 56; defeats and slays Cadwalla at Heavenfield, 57; the cross which he had set up and its miraculous cures, *ib.*; implores the monks of Iona to preach to his people, 59; becomes St. Aidan's interpreter, 60; unites with Cynigils of Wessex in bestowing Dorchester upon St. Birinus, 62; his death at Maserfield, 63; vigils, &c. for his soul, 57; wonders attending the translation of his relics, 63; his intercession, 114.
Oswald, St., of Worcester and York, i. 212, 213, 218.
Oswini, of Deira, his humility, i. 64; his death, *ib.*
Oswio, Bretwalda, murders Oswini, i. 64; builds a monastery in atonement, *ib.*; wins the victory of Winwædfield, 66; prepares Sigbert of Essex for the faith, 67; attends at the conference at Whitby, 76, 81; consults with Egbert of Kent regarding the widowed state of the church in England, 86, 87.
Otho, or Otto, a legate, i. 468, 469, 538.
Ottoboni, legate, his reception, i. 509; holds a synod at St. Paul's, &c., 510—512.
Ouini, a thane, becomes a lay brother and hears the songs of the blessed, i. 92—94.
Owen, or Little John, capture of, ii. 279; death of, 287; peculiar skill of, *ib.*
Oxford, decrees of synod at, i. Appendix D.
Oxford, burnt, i. 320; election of the chancellor of, 523; Wickliffe tried by university of, 591.

Paganism, partial return to in the great pestilence, i. 69, 134.
Paget, his account of religion, ii. 104, *n.*, 116 and *n.*, 251.
Paine, John, trial and martyrdom of, ii. 212—214.
Pallium, the, its meaning, i. 44, *n.*; sent to the bishops of Arles, 28; sent to St. Augustine, 29; to St. Justus, 44.
Palmer, Father, rector of the Savoy college, &c., ii. 359.
Palmer, William, ii. 456, 458.
Pamphleteers, conflict of Whig and Tory, ii. 444.
Pandulf, Cardinal, his public reception as legate at the court of King John, i. 452 *et seq.*; receives John's submission, 455 *et seq.*
Panzani, mission of, ii. 319; recalled, 322.
Paraphrase, Erasmus's, of the New Testament, ii. 98, 99.
Parish, in what sense used by St. Bede, i. 74, *n.*
Park. See Prior, Sedgley, &c.
Parker, of Canterbury, selected for parliament, ii. 138; purpose of his Antiquities, 3; draws up the second book of Homilies, *ib.*; consecration of, 153—157.
Parliament, the "Mad," i. 502; the "Good," 582; the "Long," ii. 325, &c.
Parr, William, marquis of Northampton, ii. 134.
Parris, Van, burnt, ii. 114.
Pasch. See Easter.
Paschal II., his firmness in the question of investitures, i. 285, 286,

291; excommunicates three bishops the envoys of Henry I., 286, 287, 290; remonstrances of, to Henry I., 298, 299; death of, 302.
Passelew, Robert, i. 490.
Pate, bishop of Worcester, ii. 151.
Patronage, rights and limitations of, i. 462 *et seq.*; invasion of by the "lay power," 505, 506. See Provisions.
Paul III., sentence of, against Henry VIII., ii. 83—85.
Paul V., agent of, at court of James I., 298; consoles the Catholics and condemns the oath of James I., 298, 300.
Paulinus, St., one of St. Augustine's fellow-labourers, i. 29; accompanies Ethelburga of Kent to Northumbria, 46; made archbishop of York, 164; his first fruitless efforts to convert Edwin and his subjects, 47; gives Edwin the sign, 50; preaches to the witenagemote, 52; his missionary labours, 54; consecrates Honorius of Canterbury, 55; administers the see of Rochester, 56; death, *ib.*; personal appearance, *ib.*
Payne, the informer, ii. 375 *et seq.*, and Appendix GG, 484.
Peacock, bishop of Chichester, his fall and recantation, ii. 9.
Peada, son of Penda, his conversion and zeal, i. 65; founds Peterborough Abbey, 100, 103, 108.
Peckham, John of, archbishop of Canterbury, humility, zeal, and learning of, i. 517, 518, 572; holds a synod at Lambeth, 518; rebukes Edward I., 520; outsteps discretion, *ib. n.*; demands restitution from the king, 522; dies, 523.
Pelagianism, some of its errors regarding free will and the necessity of grace, i. 15; its appearance in Britain, 16.
Pelagius, author of Pelagianism, his condemnation, i. 16, *n.*
Pembroke, earl of, his evil advice and death, i. 581.
Penance, i. 131, 169, 211 *et seq.*; see also Appendix, 626, 627, 628, *et seq.*
Penal laws against the Catholics (see Provisors and Præmunire), punishment for procuring the confirmation of the Holy See, &c., ii. 61; for various matters regarding the king's marriage, including that for refusing the oath of succession, 62; for preaching, 97, 100; for clergymen either refusing to adopt or speaking against the new service of Edward VI., 101; Cranmer's new but abortive punishments, 116; punishments for preaching, 135, 136; for refusing the oath of royal supremacy (A.D. 1559), a third offence being high treason, 143; for various matters against Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity, 143, 144; a defence, even in conversation, of the jurisdiction of the Holy See subjected to the penalties of a præminire, 166; a first refusal of the oath of supremacy a præmunire, and a second high treason, 166; to obtain writings, &c. from Rome high treason, to procure pictures, &c. a præmunire. 183; a refusal to return to England a partial forfeiture, *ib.*; every priest to be summarily dealt with as a traitor, and those that aided him to be hanged as felons, 235, 244, 276; punishment for belonging to, or assisting the seminaries, &c., 219, 235, 274; for being a tutor, 274; for converting any one (23rd Elizabeth), 277; fine of twelve pence for non-attendance at church, 144, 291, 295; fine of twenty pounds a month for non-attendance at church (the 23rd of Elizabeth) exacted by James, &c., 274; the same fine doubled and tripled, as well as forfeiture of two-thirds of the property, on continued refusal to receive the Protestant so-called communion, 291, 292; penalty of refusing James's oath of allegiance, 294, 299, 301, 302; no Catholic to go beyond five miles from his own dwelling, 295; disabilities, &c., attending the marriages, baptisms, and education of Catholics, 295, 296; rewards for the arrest of persons saying or hearing mass, 296; fine for having a Catholic prayer-book, *ib.*; proclamations to enforce the penal laws, 307, 311; the Commonwealth confiscates two-thirds of the estates of those that heard mass, harboured a priest, brought up their children Catholics, declined the oath of abjuration, or refused to attend the Presbyterian service, 331, 333, 334; the Corporation and Conventicle Acts, 344; the Test Acts, excluding from parliament, &c., 347, 348; no Catholic to be allowed the use of arms, or to have a legal claim to his own

horses, if above the value of £5, or to purchase land, or to retain even his own estate, it being liable to be seized by his nearest Protestant kinsman, 360, 374; enlistment and "superstitious uses," 363; mitigated, but still severe, execution of the penal laws under George II. and George III., 375 *et seq.*; Sidney Smith's remarks upon, 444, 445; number of convictions under the penal laws during the first part of the reign of Charles I., Appendix EE, 479.
Penal laws, scheme for making them popular, ii. Appendix F, 479.
Penda of Mercia, unites with Cædwalla, the Briton, against Edwin, i. 55; slain in the battle of Winwæd, 66.
Penderells, ii. 341.
Penenden Heath, in Kent, great meeting on, i. 237, 238.
People, the, not the source of ecclesiastical power, ii. Appendix K.
Perfection, question regarding the highest state of, upon earth, ii. 335.
Persecution of the Catholics, its injustice and vehemence, ii. 219, 220, 275.
Persons, Father, ii. 198; enters England with Father Campion, 202, 203; his "Reasons," &c., 203; his occupations, 204; writings of, reflected upon, 252; efforts of, to build colleges, &c., 254—256; made rector, after restoring harmony, 262; made prefect of the Jesuits on the English mission, *ib.*; founds Louvain College, 263; views of, regarding a superior for the Church in England, 265; charges against, and character of, 268, *n.*
Pestilence, the Great, i. 69, 82, 87, 113, 134.
Pestilence, the Black, i. 549, 550.
Peter, St., holds the keys, i. 10, 81, 142, 267; is prince of the Apostles, 10, 41, *n.*, 80, 155.
Peter's, St., at Rome, i. 171.
Peterborough, its privileges, i. 108; sack of, 188, 189; restoration, 214.
Petition, of the Catholics. See Supplication.
Petition, the "No-popery," ii. 383.
Peto, his zeal and courage, ii. 57.
Petre, Father, ii. 353, 358.
Petre, Bishop, ii. 365.
Petrileone, a legate, i. 396.
Phagius, ii. 114.
Philip, St., the Apostle, said to have sent St. Joseph of Arimathea to Britain, i. 3.
Philip of Spain, ii. 123, 125.
Photius, the eunuch and schismatic, i. 279.
Picts, their inroad and defeat, i. 17; the southern, inhabitants of Galloway and of parts of the Highlands, 46, 59; the northern, 58, 59 (see St. Ninian and St. Columba); keep Easter right, 82, 83.
Pictures, punishment for having Catholic, ii. 183.
Pilgrimages, i. 18, 75, 117—120 *et seq.*; abuse of, 153, 156 and *n.*
Pilgrimages of Grace, the, ii. 77, 78.
Pilling, a learned Franciscan, ii. 388, *n.*, 400.
Piracy, alarming extent of, ii. 173, 174.
Pisa, synod of, i. 605.
Pitt, William, the three questions of, ii. 393; changes the oath of the relief-bill of 1791, 404; proposes a veto, 415.
Pius II., his message to England regarding a general council, i. 618, *n.*
Pius IV., his letters to Elizabeth, ii. 163, 164.
Pius V., St., tries and excommunicates Elizabeth, ii. 179—181.
Pius VII., his arrangement of the Church in France, ii. 412; attacks upon, by the Blanchardists, 413, 414, and Appendix M; his reception of Dr. Milner, 433; replies of, to the Irish bishops, 435; and to the Irish Board, 436.
Planeta, John de, i. 354.
Plegmund, archbishop of Canterbury, i. 197, 198.
Plot, a pretended "Popish," ii. 206; Bluet's, 268; Watson's, 273; the Gunpowder, 278; Oates's, 349.
Plots, pretended. See Campion, Nichols, Walsingham, Tyrrell, &c.
Plowden, Father Charles, ii. 391, 401.
Plowden, Francis, plea of, ii. 405.
Pole, Reginald, Cardinal, his abortive commission, &c., ii. 79; consulted by Mary, 122; enters England as legate, &c., 127 and 128; holds a synod, 129—131; death of, 139.
Ponsonby, ii. 417.
Pontefract, Cluniac monastery at, &c., i. 317.
Pontigny, St. Thomas's residence at, i. 369, &c.
Pope, the "Head" of the Church, i. 14; the apostles act in his person, 13; ratifies St. David's synodal constitutions, 18, *n.* See Church,

Holy See, and Names of the respective Popes.
Poverty, indiscriminate punishment of, ii. 173.
Poynet, of Rochester and Winchester, ii. 114.
Poynter, Dr., consecration of, &c., ii. 409, 410; his statement concerning the origin of the "Fifth Resolution," 420; at St. Alban's tavern, 422 and 423; visited by Dr. Moylan, 426; president of the Bible Society, and why, 430; dislike of a veto, 437, *n.*; apologetical epistle of, during his stay at Rome, 434; signs a petition for relief, but procures a modification in its oath, 438; death of, 446; his opinion of Dr. Milner, 447, *n.*
Præmunire statutes, i. 566, 607; protests against, 608, &c. See Provisors.
Prayer-book, a Catholic, fine for possessing, ii. 296.
Prayer-book, the Church of England, lectures on, &c., ii. 454.
Preachers, paid itinerary, ii. 114.
Preaching, freedom of, impeded and destroyed, ii. 97, 99, 100, 136; proper kind of, 130; importance of, 202.
Prebendary, Letters to a, ii. 440, 445.
Preston, Father, ii. 322.
Price murdered by Puritan soldiers, ii. 334.
Priests, a blessing by which their hands were "initiated," i. 10; penance for slaying, Appendix A, 629; their duties, 158 (see Clergy), and ii. 130, 373; married, i. 252, *et seq.*, and Appendix A, ii. 345; punishment for being married, i. 360, 628 *et seq.*; the last trials for being priests, ii. Appendix GG, 484.
Primer, King Henry's, ii. 89.
Prior Park, ii. 461.
Priories, the alien, i. 526.
Prisons, state of, ii. 239, 240.
Privileges, of churches, &c., first violated by Ethelbald of Mercia, i. 154, 155.
Protestation, the, ii. 395 *et seq.*
Provisions, i. 463, 470; their object, 464, 468; complaints regarding, 475, 494, 496; tests of some of these complaints, 500, 505, and ii. 227; statutes against (see Provisors).
Provisors, statutes of, i. 558—566, 607 *et seq.*; consequences of, and protests against, and petition of the Commons for repeal of, 608; how regarded in the appeal to the nation, 609; efforts of Boniface IX. and Martin V. against, 611—613; Eugenius IV., against, 615.
Provost, Sir George, instructions to, regarding the Canadian bishops, &c., ii. 427, *n.*
Psalmody, i. 158, 159, 161, 162.
Psalms, the, why given by the Holy Spirit, i. 162. See Psalmody.
Punishments, in the ecclesiastical courts, i. 339—341.
Purgatory, charities for souls in, ii. 471.
Putta, bishop of Rochester, abandons his see, i. 100; skilful in plain-chant, 101.

Quarantotti, rescript of, ii. 432, 433, 435.
Quartodecimans, tolerated for a time, i. 36; condemned, 37.
Quendrida, sister of St. Kenelm, i. 179.
Questions, Pitt's three, ii. 393.

Radulf, or Ralph, archbishop of Canterbury, translated, &c., by royal authority, i. 297 *et seq.*; threatened with interdict, 304.
Ragner, Lodbrog, Danish pirate, i. 185.
Ralph the Welshman, contest regarding, i. 471.
Rambler, the, articles in upon college-education, ii. 411, *n.*
Real Presence, i. 83, 135, 160, 176, 243, *n.*
Records, abstraction of, i. 551.
Recusants, acts of James I. against "Popish," ii. 292, 294 *et seq.*; convictions of, under Charles I., Appendix EE, 478; who to be considered as, under George III., Appendix L, 498. See Penal Laws.
Red Marley, school at, ii. 363.
Redwald, shelters Edwin, i. 49; slays Ædilfrid, 50; his apostasy, 53.
Reeves, Father Joseph, ii. 399, and *n.*
Reformers, the so-called, dissensions among, ii. 159, and Appendix D.
Reinfrid, i. 244, 246.
Relics, not allowed when not recognized by the Church, i. 11; venerated by SS. German and Lupus, 17, 18; sent to England by St. Gregory, 29; procured at Rome by St. Willibrord, 96; by St. Wilfrid, 105; by St. Bennet Biscop, 118; processions with, 160; King Alfred's veneration for, 194; vilified by Latimer, &c., ii. 82.

Relief, first bill of (A.D. 1778), ii. 376—380; second (A.D. 1791), 404, 405. See Emancipation.
Remigius, bishop of Lincoln, i. 241 *et seq.*
Reppingdon, i. 589 *et seq.*
Requesens, ii. 191.
Resolution, the "Fifth," ii. 420, 422, 423, 425 *et seq.*
Reuclin, ii. 14, *n.*
Revolution, the, ii. 353, 358.
Rheims, the Douay seminary transferred to, ii. 191; interior of, 193; Testament of, 179.
Rich, St. Edmund. See St. Edmund of Canterbury.
Richard, prior of Dover, elected archbishop of Canterbury, i. 398; his canon on celibacy, 399; his dream and death, 406.
Richard I., his rebellion, i. 420; character, 422, 423; his imperious arbitration, 423—426; his breach of promise, 428; his imprisonment, &c., 430, 431; his violence towards the monks, &c., 434, 438; his death, 439.
Richard of Salisbury, translated to Durham, i. 470.
Richard II., parley of with Wat the Tyler, i. 588; rebukes the Lollards, 595; impedes the work of the Church, 606.
Richard, first abbot of Fountains, i. 246.
Richard, earl of Cornwall and king of the Romans, revolt of, i. 487; a guest of Frederick II., &c., 495, 500, 507; his riches, 510; present at the dedication of Westminster Abbey-church, &c., 511.
Richard, St., bishop of Chichester, becomes his brother's farm-servant, i. 498; becomes St. Edmund's chancellor, *ib.*; studies the Holy Scriptures, 499; made bishop of Chichester, being consecrated by Innocent IV., *ib.*; the king's enmity and Richard's patience and firmness, 500; recovers his property, and in what condition, *ib.*; excommunicates the earl of Cornwall, &c., *ib.*; his firmness and death, 501.
Richard of Hexham, on loss of records, i. 165, *n.*
Richardson, Lawrence, replies of, &c., ii. 216 *et seq.*
Richborough, the Roman fortress of, i. 23.
Richmond, earl of, i. 324.
Ridley, judges Bonner and invades his see, ii. 110, 111; his treason, 119; death, 126.
Rievaulx, a Cistercian abbey, i. 246.
Rigg, of Oxford, i. 589.
Riots of 1780, ii. 384, and Appendix I, 493.
Ripon, i. 90, 134, 142 *et seq.* See St. Wilfrid.
Rishanger, succeeds Matthew Paris as royal historiographer, i. 503, *n.*
Robert de Kilwardby. See Kilwardby.
Robert, bishop of Lincoln, i. 357.
Robert of Salisbury, i. 325.
Robert, bishop of Chester, i. 286 *et seq.*
Robert, bishop of Hereford, i. 359; repentance of, 274.
Robert of Normandy, his evil advice, i. 285.
Robert, earl of Gloucester, i. 310, 318—321.
Robert, earl of Leicester, encourages the monks, i. 426.
Robert of Winchelsea. See Winchelsea.
Robert of Canterbury, i. 228.
Robert, St. Thomas's confessor, i. 391, 394.
Roberts, John, O.S.B., martyred, ii. 303.
Roches, Peter des, bishop of Winchester, faithful to Henry III., i. 458; rivalry between, and Hubert de Burgh, 472, 474; suspected of simony, 477; triumphs over Hubert, 480; excommunicated, &c., 481—483.
Rochester. See SS. Justus and Paulinus, Putta, Fisher, &c.
Rogation-days, i. 150, 159.
Roger, bishop of Salisbury, i. 308, 309.
Roger, bishop of Worcester, i. 359; his bold reproof of the king, 376.
Roger of York, i. 329, 353, 375, 381, 406, *n.*
Roger, chancellor of Henry I., i. 288.
Roman. See Church.
Romanus of Rochester, drowned, i. 62.
Romanus, a priest in Northumbria, i. 71; present at the conference at Whitby, 76.
Rome, pilgrimages to, i. 18, 75, 88, 118—123; abuse of pilgrimages to, 153, 156 and *n.*; English college at, ii. 195—197; suppressed, 410; restored, 465, *n.*
Ronan, his efforts to correct the observance of Easter, i. 72.
Rood-lofts, ii. 131, 149 *et seq.*

Ross, his description of the results of the civil wars, i. 620 *et seq.*
Rupert, Prince, influences Charles II. to recall the declaration of indulgence, ii. Appendix F, 481.
Russel, Francis, earl of Bedford, ii. 134.

Saberct, the first Christian king of Essex, i. 42; his sons encourage idolatry, and banish the clergy, 42, 43.
Sacraments, parochial, ii. 314. See Baptism, Eucharist, &c.
Sacrifice, peculiar to priests and bishops, i. 626.
Sacrificial altars esteemed "most holy," and "the seat of the heavenly sacrifice," i. 10.
Sadler, Ralph, his account of the Catholicity of the North, ii. 172.
Salvation, the doctrine of exclusive, ii. Appendix N, second extract.
Sampson, bishop of Chichester, imprisoned for denying the king's supremacy, ii. 89.
Sanders, ii. 215.
Santi Quattri, the cardinal, his integrity, ii. 28.
Sardica, council of, its incidental declaration of the power of the Holy See, i. 13, 14; British bishops at, *ib.*
Sarum, Old, its castle and cathedral, i. 459.
Sarum, New, or Salisbury, its cathedral, i. 460.
Satisfaction, how to be made, i. 161, 162. See Penance, &c.
Saturday, often a voluntary fasting-day, i. Appendix A, 626.
Saville, Sir George, advocates the first Catholic relief bill, ii. 377.
Saviour's, St., or Christchurch, Canterbury, i. 35.
Savoy, the, attacked, i. 583; given to the Jesuits, ii. 359.
Sawtre, a priest and Wickliffite, burnt, i. 597.
Saxulf, first abbot of Peterborough, i. 100, 103, 108; becomes third bishop of Lichfield, i. 100.
Scarborough, parliament at, &c., i. 301; burnt, 536.
Schism, the Greek, i. 279, 280.
Schism, the Great, i. 602—606.
Schismatics, how to be regarded, i. 11, 135.
School, of the English at Rome, i. 171.
School, the Saxon or English, ii. 195, *n.*
Schools, i. 53, 158; ii. 105, 131, Appendix BB, 345, 363.
Scott, bishop of Chester, ii. 151.
Scott, William, O.S.B., martyred, ii. 303.
Scriptures, the Holy, many copies of, brought from Rome by St. Bennet Biscop, i. 118; a complete copy of, to be presented to the Pope, 123; copies of the old translation of (Vetus Itala), and of the new (St. Jerome's, the present Vulgate), brought from Rome for monastic libraries, 123; how youth should be trained to the study of, 158; the singing of, 159.
Scriptures, the Holy, the study of, i. 59, 61, 86 *et seq.*; ii. Appendix N, 507.
Sebbi, king of Essex, faithful to grace, i. 69.
Sedgley Park, ii. 364, 450.
See, the Holy or Apostolical, power of its decrees, i. 148, 156; punishments for defending, by writing or preaching, the supremacy of, ii. 143; or even by ordinary discourse, &c., 166.
Selsey, its monastery, i. 112; the child's vision there, 113.
Seminaries, ii. 131, 177, 178, 191, 195, 221; proclamation, &c., against students at, 219, 296.
Sens, archbishop of, i. 372.
Sequestrations, under the Commonwealth, ii. 333.
Sergeant, John, ii. 316, *n.*, 327, *n.*
Seville, college at, ii. 255.
Seymours, the two, ii. 93, 94. See Somerset.
Sharples, Dr., ii. 463.
Shaftesbury, the earl of, schemes, &c. of, ii. 347—350.
Sharrock, Dr., coadjutor-bishop of Western district, ii. 409.
Sharrock, James Jerome, O.S.B., ii. 409.
Shaxton, bishop of Salisbury, ii. 71, 91, and *n.*
Shelley, prior of St. John's, Clerkenwell, ii. 151.
Shelley, imprisoned for life for petitioning, ii. 241.
Shert, John, replies of, ii. 216.
Sherwine, martyrdom of, ii. 211, 212.
Shrewsbury, the earl of, his opposition to Bill of Supremacy, ii. 145.
Shrewsbury, burnt, i. 481.
Sigfrid, abbot of Wearmouth, i. 120, 122.
Sick, anointing of the, i. Appendix A.
Sidroc, the Dane, i. 190, 191.

Sigbert, of East Anglia, a Christian, i. 53; probably invited St. Felix, *ib.*
Sigbert the Good, of Essex, converted, i. 67; his zeal for the conversion of his people, *ib.*; disregards St. Cedd's sentence, *ib.*; his repentance and punishment, *ib.*
Simeon of Durham, his history, &c., i. 246, *n.*
Simon Stock, St. See Stock.
Sin, original, i. Appendix D, 633.
Singing, church, i. 121, 122, 124, 148, 159, *et seq.*
Slaves, how treated, i. 20, 113, 127, 177; limitation or suppression of the sale of, i. Appendix A, 230, 288.
Smith, Dr. Richard, who, ii. 309; made bishop, &c., 310; scruples of, &c., 312; obliged to leave the country, 314.
Smith, Bishop, one of the first four vicars apostolic, ii. 356.
Smith, Sidney, his letter on the penal laws, &c., ii. 444 *et seq.*
Society, "The Catholic Bible," ii. 430; its condemnation, *ib.*
Somerset, duke of, ii. 97; acts of parliament in compliance with the wishes of, 100 *et seq.*; destroys his brother, 100; sacrileges of, *ib.*
Southampton, taken and burnt, i. 543.
Southwell, Father, his missionary labours, &c., ii. 244—246; arrest, tortures, trial, &c., of, 247—250.
Southworth, president of Sedgley Park, ii. 442.
Sparhawk, the unworthy abbot, i. 228.
Spelman, theories of, ii. 5, 6.
Spencer, de, i. 536, 542.
Spirituals, i. 572 *et seq.*; what matters are purely, 503.
Stafford, Lord, death of, ii. 350.
Staffordshire clergy, the, ii. 407, 442.
Stamford, armed parliament at, i. 532.
Standard, battle of the, i. 312—315.
Stapleton, Dr. Gregory, ii. 409.
Stephen, King, i. 307, 309, 318.
Stevenson, his remarks upon the supposed reply of the abbot of Bangor, i. 39, *n.*; his reply to the assertion that St. Bede's history has been interpolated, 40, *n.*
Stock, St. Simon, general of the Carmelites, ii. end of Appendix B, 471.
Stonor, Bishop, ii. 369.
Stonyhurst, ii. 452.
Strafford, Lord, ii. 328.
Stratford, John de, archbishop of Canterbury, i. 544; his public confession, and his contest with Edward III., 545—547.
Strype, character of, as an historian, ii. 14, *n.*, 18, *n.*
Stubbs, the Dominican chronicler, i. 231, *n.*
Sudbury, Simon of, archbishop of Canterbury, rebuked by Gregory XI., i. 582.
Suffolk, the earl of, his almshouses, ii. 472.
Suffolk, the duke of, his preconcerted exclamation, &c., ii. 36, 37, 41, 124.
Sugar, John, martyrdom of, ii. 275.
Sunday. See Lord's Day.
Supplication, the Catholics', ii. 271, 272, *n.*
Supremacy, the Pope's, i. 10, 11, 14, 88, 103 *et seq.*; martyrs to, 555 *et seq.*
Supremacy, royal, ii. 46—48, 61, 64, 141, 142; oath of, under Elizabeth, 150, 151; attempt to bring the Canadian bishops under, 427, *n.*
Surrey, earl of, ii. 93, 94.
Sussex, ii. 169.
Sweating sickness, ii. 32.
Sweyn, i. 219, 225.
Swithin, St., i. 183, 184; profession of obedience of, Appendix C.
Synods, how often to be held, i. 99, 167; diocesan, 161 *et seq.*

Talbot, archbishop of Dublin, ii. 345.
Talbot, Bishop Thomas, ii. 370, 390.
Talbot, Bishop James, ii. 375, 390, 394.
Tarbes, the bishop of, ii. 33, 34.
Tartars, their inroad in the thirteenth century, i. 466.
Tavern, St. Alban's, the meeting at, ii. 422.
Taxes, i. 168; to what extent the Pope sometimes forbade the imposition of, 529; double upon Catholics, ii. Appendix F, 362, *n.*
Templars, account of, i. 539, 540.
Test, the two Test Acts, ii. 347, 348, 360; repeal of, 447.
Theft from churches, its punishment, i. 7.
Theodore, St., of Tarsus, chosen seventh archbishop of Canterbury, and on what condition, i. 88; his reception in England, and his active zeal, 89; deposes St. Chad and restores St. Wilfrid, 90; holds the synod of Hertford, 97; deposes Winfrid, 100; divides, on his own

authority, the diocese of Northumbria, 102; his conduct condemned by the Holy See, 105; holds the synod of Hatfield, 106 *et seq.*; holds a synod at Twyford, 134; his atonement to St. Wilfrid, 136; his death, *ib.*
Theobald, archbishop of Canterbury, consecrated by the legate Alberic, &c., i. 316, 329, 335.
Thirlby, the pretended bishop of Westminster, ii. 111, *n.* to 112.
Thomas, archbishop of York, demurs to make a profession of obedience to Lanfranc, i. 240; submits, yielding back his crosier to Alexander II., &c., 241, 252; interrupts the ceremony previous to St. Anselm's consecration, 261.
Thomas, another archbishop of York, demurs, &c., i. 295.
Thomas, St., of Hereford, his appeal and death, i. 520, *n.*
Thomas, St., of Canterbury, his youth, i. 327 *et seq.*; archdeacon, and then chancellor, 329, 330, 333; made archbishop, 335, 336; displays at Woodstock his love of freedom, 337; defends in synod at Westminster the rights and principles of the courts Christian or ecclesiastical, but finally agrees to consent to the Customs, 339—342; withholds, but again gives his consent at the great council at Clarendon, 343, 344; his comments upon the Customs, and his final refusal, 345—348; charges against, at Northampton, 349; deliberations of, 351—358; his escape, 359 *et seq.*; resigns, 368; restored, 369; his stay at Pontigny, 369, 370; his dream, 370; his stay at Sens, 371; his firmness, 372; his letters to the Pope, 377; his return, 380—383; his preparation for death, 387; his martyrdom, 388—393; his miracles, 394; his canonization, 399; translation of his relics, 400; mock trial of, &c., ii. 83; feast of, 356.
Thorney, now Westminster, i. 226.
Thurkil, i. 219.
Thurlbey, bishop of Ely, ii. 150.
Toleration, Act of, ii. 359; first act of, regarding Catholics, 377, Appendix H, 492.
Toly, a thane, and afterwards a monk, his valour and death, i. 187.
Topcliffe, the gaoler, ii. 247 *et seq.*
Toret, a hermit of Croyland, i. 188.
Tostig, Earl, insolence of, at Rome, and submission, i. 229.
Traci, William de, i. 386 *et seq.*, 395, *n.*
Travelling to be avoided on Sundays, i. 159.
Travers, an apostate Jesuit, ii. 359.
Tregian, a Catholic gentleman, imprisoned for the faith, ii. 186 *et seq.*
Tremellius, ii. 114.
Trent, Council of, ii. 163—165.
Trevaux, verbal apology of, ii. 414.
Trinity Sunday, made a solemn feast by St. Thomas of Canterbury, i. 336.
Trinity, the Blessed, i. 11, 13.
Trinoda Necessitas, i. 164, *n.*
Trivet, Nicholas, i. 502, *n.*, 513, 572.
Tuda, fourth bishop of Lindisfarne, i. 82; dies of the great pestilence, *ib.*
Tunstall, bishop of Durham, his spirited opposition, &c., ii. 47, 150.
Turgar, a child in Croyland Abbey, i. 188, 189.
Turks, the, ii. 21.
Turstin, or Thurstan, archbishop of York, claims exemption from the jurisdiction of Canterbury, i. 301; consecrated by Callixtus II., 302; refused admission to England, 302, 303; obtains it, &c., 304; contest of, with the see of Canterbury, and with his own suffragans in Scotland, 304, 306; his efforts to defend his people, 312; resigns his see, 316, 317; his death, *ib.*
Tutors, penalties against Catholics, ii. 274, 361.
Twyford, synod at, i. 134.
Tynemouth burnt, i. 185.
Tyrrell, fall of, and recantation, &c., ii. 234.
Tythes, payment and division of, i. 168, 204, Appendix A, 627.

Ubba, the Dane, i. 189.
Unction, Extreme, i. Appendix A.
Uniformity, Acts of, ii. 101, 143, 146.
Universities, opinions of, on the divorce, solicited, &c., ii. 42 *et seq.*; state of, in the beginning of Elizabeth's changes, 152.
Urban II., Pope, i. 260, *n.*, 266, 279; holds the synod of Bari, 279.
Urban III. regulates the application of offerings at the shrine of St. Thomas, i. 400; his decisions regarding the monks, &c., 413, 414.

Urban IV., his efforts to restore peace to England, i. 508.
Urban V., requests and silently abandons the tribute begun by John, i. 557; his constitution against pluralists, how defeated, 564; grants "provisions," and strives for peace, and dies, *ib.*
Urban VI., election of, i. 602, 605; encouraged by St. Catherine of Sienna, 603.
Urban VIII. appoints Bishop Smith, ii. 310; condemns the oath of James I., &c., 312; his expostulatory letter, 316; sends Panzani to England, 319.
Ushaw, St. Cuthbert's College, ii. 411, 465.

Valladolid, college at, ii. 255, 372.
Vere, de, Alberic, i. 309.
Vergil, Polydore, i. 623; ii. 1, 15, 20, *n.*
Verities, unwritten, ii. 102.
Vernal equinox, when and how fixed, i. 36, 37.
Vernon Hall, Benedictines at (see Errata), ii. 412.
Veto, the, origin and object of, &c., ii. 415, 416 *et seq.*, 420 *et seq.*, 429, 430, 438.
Viaticum, i. 114, 122, 129, 155, 627 *et seq.*
Vicars apostolic, ii. 354; powers of, 371; resolutions of, regarding their difficulties, 410; the veto, &c., 437; declaration of, 446, Appendix N; the number of, doubled, 462.
Victor, Pope, threatens to excommunicate some churches in Asia Minor, i. 36.
Vighard, the archbishop-elect of Canterbury, dies of pestilence, i. 87.
Vigils for the dead, i. 57.
Vincent Ferrar, St., i. 603; apostolical mission of, 604.
Vini, thrust into part of another's diocese, i. 73; consecrates St. Chad, 86; buys the see of London (about A.D. 669), 74.
Virgilius, St., of Arles, consecrates as papal legate St. Augustine, the apostle of England, i. 26.
Virgin, the Blessed, church of, i. 3, 44, 124 *et seq.*; "Intemerata," 610, *n.*; ii. 102.
Visitation, episcopal, to be annual, i. 157, 167; a royal, ii. 75, 76 and *n.*, 99.
Vitalian's solicitude for the Church in England, i. 87; sends St. Theodore and Adrian, the abbot, 88.

Wakes or vigils at the dedication of churches, origin of, i. 31.
Walcher, bishop of Durham, endows Jarrow, i. 245; his death, 247 *et seq.*
Waldon, Thomas of, i. 577.
Walker, Sir Peter, in the pillory for the faith, ii. 137.
Wall, martyrdom of, ii. 351.
Wallace, i. 529, 533.
Walpole, unjust assessment of, ii. 362.
Walsh, Dr., account of, ii. 463.
Walsingham, of St. Alban's, i. *ns.* to 583, 591.
Walsingham, unprincipled schemes of, ii. 233, *n. et seq.*; insolence of, 239.
Walstan, St., i. 224.
Walter, legate, i. 272, 273.
Walter, archbishop of Canterbury, i. 538; attempts to call a synod in the king's name, 539; wins obedience to the Pope's arrangement of the lands of the Templars, 540; orders anathema to be pronounced against perjured jurymen, 541.
Walter, archdeacon of Norwich, his leaden cope, i. 450.
Walter d'Espec, i. 312.
Wantsum, the, once a broad river, i. 23.
Ward, a missionary and martyr, ii. 329.
Ward, author of the "Ideal," ii. 458.
Ward, Margaret, martyrdom of, ii. 243.
Wardour, castle of, siege of, ii. 340.
Warham, archbishop of Canterbury, marries Henry VIII. and Catherine of Arragon, ii. 17; feebly opposes the divorce, 19, *n.*; his dying protest, 48, 49.
Warkworth on the civil wars, i. 619.
Wat the Tyler, revolt and death of, i. 586—588.
Watson, bishop of Lincoln, his boldness and imprisonment, &c., ii. 147—150; death of, 257.
Watson, a missionary, interference of, in politics, &c., and death of, ii. 273.
Wearmouth (see St. Bennet Biscop, &c.), restored, i. 245; left, 249.
Wednesday, often a voluntary fasting day, i. Appendix A, 626.
Weedall, Dr., builds the new college at Oscott, ii. 464.
Weld, Cardinal, account of, ii. 452, 453.
Wellington, duke of, ii. 448.
Wells, see of, i. 198 and *n.*

Wendover, Roger de, i. 399, *n.*, 464, *n.*
Welsh, the, or Britons, their chastisement, i. 18; their pilgrimages, *ib.*; the rule of their churches, 19; Edward's first war against, 521 *et seq.*
Wesley, John, clamours of, for repeal of the first Catholic Relief Bill, ii. 380, 382.
Westminster, synods at, i. 288, 305, 340, 481; palace of, burnt, 507; abbey church of, 511.
Westminster Abbey, why, and by whom built, i. 226; second suppression of, 160.
Westmoreland, earl of, ii. 169.
Weston, Father, named superior in Wisbeach prison, ii. 259.
Wharton, his assertion regarding Osbern, i. 223, *n.*; and concerning married priests, 231, *n.*
Wharton, apostasy of, ii. 388.
Whelock, Abraham, his theories on the British Church, ii. 4 *et seq.*
Whitby, i. 246.
White, Sir Thomas, founder of the college of St. John the Baptist, Oxford, &c., ii. 179, 199.
White, bishop of Winchester, imprisoned for his zeal, ii. 135; a second time, 148, 149, 150.
Whitgreaves, ii. 341.
Whiting, Richard, last abbot of Glastonbury, ii. 80.
Whyttington, Robert, his literary encounters with Lilye, ii. 12.
Wickliffe, his wardenship, &c., i. 569; attacks of, upon the friars, 577; poor priests of, 578; motives of, 579; patron of, 581; is examined, 583, 584; errors of, 585; appeals to the secular power, but is condemned, 591; submission and death of, 592.
Wikes, his character as a chronicler, i. 512, *n.*
Wilfrid, St., at Landisfarne, i. 74; his first journey to Rome, 75; becomes abbot of Ripon, *ib.*; spokesman of Bishop Agilbert at the Whitby conference, 76 *et seq.*; chosen bishop, 85; retires to Ripon, 86; his generous conduct towards St. Chad, 90; his scholars and buildings, *ib.*; his disinterested advice to St. Etheldreda, 91; unjustly suspected by Ermenburga, *ib.*; sends deputies to the synod of Hertford, 97; continuance of Ermenburga's envy, 102; St. Theodore won to her cause, *ib.*; St. Wilfrid's prophecy, and its fulfilment, 103; St. Wilfrid's appeal, *ib.*; converts the Frisians, 104; his perils, *ib.*; the decision of the Holy See favourable to, 105; collects relics, &c., *ib.*; is present at the synod of Hatfield, 108, 109; is imprisoned, 110; is exiled, 111; converts Sussex, 112, 136; visits and pardons St. Theodore, 136; is reinstated, 137; his new exile, *ib.*; his oration in the synod of Onestrefield, and his second appeal to Rome, 137—139; his vision, 139; resisted, and finally reinstated again, 139, 140; consents to retain only the see of Hexham, 141; dies, 142; his epitaph, 142, 143.
Wilkins, editor of the "Concilia," &c., his unwarranted account of British bishops, 39, *n.*; his interpolated passage from Spelman, 333, *n.*
Wilks, Rev. Joseph, supports the Committee, disobeys his bishop, &c., ii. 394, 399 and *n.*, 406, 407.
William of Malmesbury, his account of Glastonbury records, &c., i. 2—5; could find little regarding the bishops of the 8th, 9th, and 10th centuries, 149, *n.*; occasional inaccuracy of, 163, *n.*, 167, *n.*; his remark on St. Oswald, 213, *n.*, and on Aldred of York, 229, *n.* 2; his life of St. Wulstan, drawn from what sources, 229, *n.* 1.
William I., the Conqueror, i. 233 *et seq.*; hampers the freedom of the Church, 242; founds Battle Abbey, 330 *et seq.*; his ravages of the North, 247, 248; entreats the Pope to establish monks instead of clerics at Durham, 249; his injunctions regarding the ecclesiastical laws, 253; his dying lamentations, 256.
William II., Rufus, violates his oath, i. 257; lets out the property of the Church, &c., 258; his repentance, and return to vice, 258, 259 *et seq.*; his persecution of St. Anselm at Rockingham and Winchester, 267 *et seq.*, 275 *et seq.*; his death, 282.
William III., ii. 359, 362.
William, archbishop of Canterbury, i. 304, 405; made legate, 306.
William, St., archbishop of York, continued troubles regarding his election, i. 322, 323, 325; his death, 326.
William, bishop of Durham, changes the clerics of his cathedral into monks, i. 248, 249; foments the

anger of Rufus against St. Anselm, 269; his base inconsistency, 270.
William, dean of St. Peter's, York, i. 316.
William, son of Henry I., i. 303, 304.
William, the dean of York, becomes bishop of Durham, i. 323, 324, 325.
William, envoy of Henry I. at Rome, i. 290, 291.
William, earl of Pembroke, i. 458.
William, bishop-elect of Winchester, i. 289.
Willibrord, St., preaches in the nearer Frisia, i. 96; obtains the Pope's benediction, as well as the relics of apostles and martyrs, *ib.*; made archbishop of Utrecht, 97.
Wilton, defeat of Stephen at, i. 321.
Wiltshire, earl of, his embassy, &c., ii. 42.
Winchcomb, Benedictine monastery at, i. 244.
Winchelsey, Robert of, archbishop of Canterbury, i. 523, 526 *et seq.*; his cheerful firmness, zeal, &c., 527, 528, *et seq.*; accused and acquitted, 534; excommunicates invaders of ecclesiastical liberty, &c., 538; dies, *ib.*; his devotion to the Blessed Virgin, *ib.*
Winchester, made a bishop's see, i. 73; its monasteries, 214; synod at, 216 and *n.*, 251, 252; meeting on the Downs of, 319.
Windebank, secretary of Charles I., ii. 319, 322.
Windsor, reconciliation between Rufus and St. Anselm at, i. 273.
Windsor, Anthony, remarkable interview of, with Bradshaw, in the time of the Protectorate, ii. Appendix F, 479.
Wine, use of, in the Church, i. 519 and *n.*
Winefrid, St., devotion to, i. 610, *n.*; ii. 285; miracles wrought by the intercession of, 286, and Appendix DD, 478.
Winfrid, St. Chad's deacon, and his successor in the see of Lichfield, i. 95, 97; deposed, 100.
Wini. See Vini.
Wisbeach, castle of, the confessors in, ii. 257.
Wiseman, Nicholas, Cardinal, attempts to guide the Oxford movement, ii. 453, 460; at the Holy See, when coadjutor of Dr. Walsh, 463; first archbishop of Westminster, 464; "Appeal" of, 464.
Witham, Dr., president of Douay, ii. 365.
Wolsey, Thomas, Cardinal, account of, &c., ii. 20, 24; his dread of the royal displeasure, 26, 30, 32; his reply to Suffolk, 36; his zeal for learning, 10, 38; his tame submission, 38; his arrest, death, and character, 38, 39.
Woodhead, ii. 327, *n.*
Woodstock, great council at, i. 337; St. Thomas's reception at, 349.
Worthington, president of Douay, ii. 305.
Wotton, Dean, refuses the see of Canterbury, ii. 153.
Wulfheri, or Wulpheri, king of Mercia, exerts his influence, as chief lord, for the final conversion of Essex, i. 70; his simony, 74; unites with Peada and Saxulf in founding the abbey of Peterborough, 103; his fruitless combination of the southern states against Ecgfrid, *ib.*
Wulfred or Wilfrid, of Canterbury, his contest with Kenulf, i. 178, 179.
Wulstan, St., made bishop of Worcester, i. 230; his account of the clergy after Danish wars, 210, *n.*; his devotion for souls in purgatory, &c., 230; his contest with Aldred, 231, 232; his advice to St. Anselm, 262.
Wyatt, revolt of, ii. 124.
Wye, the, civil war in the valley of, i. 481.

Yates, Campion's arrest at the house of, ii. 205.
York, its bishop at Arles, A.D. 312, i. 12 and *n.*; privileges of its see, 30, 109. See also William of, Turstin, St. William of, &c.

Zachary, Pope, his epistles to the synod of Clovesho, i. 157.
Zuinglius, ii. 23.

THE END.

COX AND WYMAN, PRINTERS, GREAT QUEEN STREET, LINCOLN'S-INN FIELDS.

282.42H
V.2
J. F613

Flanagan, Very Rev. Canon,

History of Ch. in England.

1915
Mar 12 Hornby
May 14

282.42H
F613
v.2

22951

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
00055440